4225. d. 17.

REMARKS

ON A LATE PUBLICATION,

INTITLED,

"A SCRIPTURAL CONFUTATION
"OF THE ARGUMENTS
"AGAINST THE
"ONE GODHEAD
"OF THE
"FATHER, SON, AND HOLY GHOST,
"PRODUCED BY
"THE REVEREND MR. LINDSEY
"IN HIS LATE APOLOGY.
"BY A LAYMAN."

IN

AN ADDRESS TO THE AUTHOR.

BY A MEMBER OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

"THERE IS BUT ONE GOD, THE FATHER.
"ST. PAUL. 1 COR. viii. 6."

YORK:
PRINTED BY C. ETHERINGTON,
FOR
JOHN BELL, No. 132, IN THE STRAND,
LONDON.
MDCC LXXV.
[PRICE HALF A CROWN.]

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE following Remarks were already in the preſs, when the Remarker firſt ſaw the ſecond edition of the *Scriptural Confutation* advertiſed; it was therefore out of his power to take any notice of that, as otherwiſe he certainly would, if any material alterations have been made. All he can now do, is to inform the public that theſe Remarks relate ſolely to the firſt edition.

If Mr. Burgh has corrected any of his numberleſs ſophiſms, and aſtoniſhing perverſions of Scripture, it will give the greater pleaſure to his opponent, the more numerous ſuch corrections are; and indeed Mr. Burgh himſelf will, in the ſame proportion, become a more reſpectable adverſary.

As his book made its firſt appearance, it was a moſt crude performance; though

men, whoſe prejudices co-incide with his own, have cried it up exceedingly. One would ſuppoſe, however, that none but ſuch, could poſſibly find any thing to commend in a writer, whoſe whole reaſoning is moſt illogical, and who, to ſerve his hypotheſis, has availed himſelf, through his whole book, of ambiguous and erroneous tranſlations of the Scriptures, even where the ſmalleſt attention to the original muſt have given a very different view.

Many inſtances of both kinds will be found pointed out in the following remarks, and many more were left unnoticed, for a reaſon given in its proper place. Of theſe latter the reader is intreated to pardon the mention of one, ſo extraordinary, that one would hope cooler conſideration has excluded it from the new edition. It will be found at page 134 of his book, where he quotes St. Paul's charge to Timothy.

" I give

ADVERTISEMENT.

" I give thee charge in the ſight of God,
" who quickeneth all things, and before
" Jeſus Chriſt, who before Pontius Pilate
" witneſſed a good confeſſion, that thou
" keep this commandment without ſpot,
" unrebukeable, until the appearing of
" our Lord Jeſus Chriſt: which in his
" times he ſhall ſhew, who is the bleſſed
" and only Potentate, the King of Kings,
" and Lord of Lords; who only hath im-
" mortality, dwelling in the light, which
" no man can approach unto, whom no
" man hath ſeen nor can ſee. 1 Tim. vi.
" 13, 14, 15."

It was barely poſſible for a mere Engliſh reader to refer the perſonal pronoun *he* to the preceding words Chriſt Jeſus; and then the relative *who*, which follows, would point *him* out as the bleſſed and *only* Potentate, *who only* hath immortality and dwelleth in the light which no man can approach unto; and then " the glory of
" God unapproachable by man is aſcribed
" to Jeſus Chriſt, and his (Supreme) God-
" head is incontrovertibly eſtabliſhed."

This

This was an advantage, which a diſputant in diſtreſs was not to deſpiſe, and accordingly our *Confuter* ſnapped at it with the blind eagerneſs of an hungry fiſh, and has hooked himſelf ſo effectually, that all the tricks of ſophiſtry, and all the powers of logic will never diſengage him.

Let us ſuppoſe him to be right in his interpretation. Then he, who is the *only* Potentate, and who *only* hath immortality, is Jeſus Chriſt perſonally diſtinguiſhed from the Father, and from the Holy Ghoſt: For if Jeſus Chriſt is not a perſonal name, it is impoſſible to conceive it to have any uſe at all. What then? Why, then neither the Father, nor the Holy Ghoſt, can perſonally be a Potentate, nor perſonally poſſeſs immortality, in ſo eminent a degree at leaſt, as Jeſus Chriſt, who is perſonally the *only* Potentate, and *alone* perſonally poſſeſſes immortality. This conſequence cannot be avoided, except the *Confuter* will directly own himſelf a Sabellian, an Heretic of ſo abſurd

ſurd tenets, that the learned Dr. Tucker ſeems to think it impoſſible for any ſuch to exiſt in this enlightened age; and this again is not reconcileable with what he ſays about Octavius, Lepidus, and Anthony.

He who quotes Greek ought to have known, that there is no ambiguity in the original, but that two different perſons are marked in the ſtrongeſt manner, ſo ſtrongly, that the attributes of the one cannot be the attributes of the other. In that there is no *he*, no *who*, which led our willing captive into ſo fatal a difficulty. *Keep*, ſays St. Paul, *this commandment——unrebukeable until the appearing of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt: which in his own times the bleſſed and* ONLY *Potentate ſhall ſhew*, (bring to paſs,) *the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, He, who* ONLY *hath immortality.* Here, and not before, *he* and *who* have any thing to do. The *only* Potentate, *He*, who *only* hath immortality, is to bring to paſs the manifeſtation of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. This is an unaccountable manner of expreſſion.

preſſion, if Jeſus Chriſt is to bring about his own manifeſtation; and if he is not, the word only, twice repeated, excludes *him*, and all other beings in the univerſe, from thoſe great privileges thus appropriated to the one ſuper-eminent Perſonage.

To what can it be imputed, that this writer ſo ſtrangely abuſes his own and his reader's underſtanding? O Bigotry, great are thy powers! Thou haſt prompted him to ſay, that "the God of truth is "a dupe to his own artifices," if revelation teach not, what the *Confuter* thinks it ought; and we may ſay, it is hoped without *impiety*, that himſelf is the *dupe* of his own Enthuſiaſm.

ADDENDA.

ADDENDA.

The following paragraph was, by miſtake, omitted in the copy tranſcribed for the preſs, and the reader is requeſted to ſupply it at page 6th, after the paragraph beginning, Thirdly.

Fourthly; When it is known, that the Supreme God "is without body, parts, or paſſions," it is at the ſame time known, and with as full evidence, that whoever is not "without body, parts, or paſſions," is not Supreme God.

Page 31. Note. The participle of the preſent tenſe is uſed by the beſt Claſſics to expreſs a thing prior to the time of the verb, as in Salluſt, Bell. Jugurth. juſt after Micipſa's death-bed ſpeech. "Hiempſal etiam antea *deſpiciens* ignobili-
"tatem Jugurthæ — dextra Atherbalem
"aſſedit."

ERRATA.

Page 13, *line* 17, put a mark of interrogation after *all this?*
Page 17, *line* 3, from the bottom, *for* Heritics, *read* Heretics
Page 20, *line* 8, *dele* an *before* enormous
Page 31, *line* 5, from the bottom, *for* know, *read* knew.
Page 34, *line* 8, *for* Ποτιρα δ' ν οικοις, *read* Ποτιρα δ' ἐν οικοις
Page 35, *line* 12, *for* οικοι *read* οἶκοι
Page 52, *line* 9, *for* laws, *read* law
Page 56, *line* 18, *for* Gods, *read* God
Page 71, *lines* 12, *and* 21, *for* propoſition, *read* prepoſition
Page 81, *line* 6, *for* there, *read* theſe

PREFACE.

THE Author of the Scriptural Confutation calls himſelf a "Young Man." * This is, perhaps, the beſt excuſe that can be made for that ſtrange rhapſody which he has thrown together under the denomination of a Book; and I can readily believe this teſtimony of himſelf: For his work bears all the marks of an underſtanding yet very imperfectly matured. It may therefore be the fault of his age, more than of the man, that he engaged ſo forwardly in an undertaking, for which he is altogether unfit. Young men have not always that modeſty, which of all qualities moſt becomes them, and the want of which ſometimes throws them into the moſt aukward and diſtreſſing ſituations; and ſo it has happened in this particular caſe.

* Page 223.

Our young man has undertaken to give a Scriptural demonſtration of a Trinity of equal Perſons in the Godhead, that three Perſons equally and individually God, are all three but one and the ſame God; yet does he at the ſame time grant that no ſuch propoſition is contained in the whole Bible *, that at moſt it is but hinted at, even where the greateſt light is afforded, and referred to as a matter already known. But who knows not that hints are liable to be miſtaken, and that we who live in an age ſo diſtant from that of the Apoſtles, can by no means know what they taught, but from what they have left us written? The taking it for granted, therefore, that the firſt Preachers of the Goſpel taught the "Divinity of our bleſſed Lord," that is, his Supreme Godhead, to their reſpective converts, is taking for granted the very thing that ought to be proved.

Let us however ſee what he ſays. This propoſition is not in the Books of the Old Teſtament, becauſe the prophecies relating to Jeſus Chriſt are there but obſcurely expreſſed: It is not in the four Goſpels, becauſe they contain only the hiſtory of what Jeſus did, while he was reſident upon earth, and this was a doctrine improper for that time,

* Page 43 compared with 187, &c. See the whole ſecond chapter.

and

and not to be revealed till after his aſcent into heaven: It is not to be found in the Acts of the Apoſtles; for he gives up that Book except one text, which I have proved to be utterly impertinent to his purpoſe as it ſtands, and ſtill more, in all probability a corrupted reading. There remains, therefore, only the Apoſtolical Epiſtles, and the Revelation of St. John. The Epiſtles contain no ſuch propoſition, he ſays, becauſe they were written to churches and perſons already inſtructed in the great myſtery of a Trinity, and it was unneceſſary to teach them over again what they well knew; it was ſufficient to refer to it in general terms. From the Revelation he has not offered to produce a ſingle text, that directly teaches any ſuch myſtery, and therefore gives up that Book among the reſt.

This, I think, he will not deny to be, in few words, a fair repreſentation of what he has ſaid; and if it be, how will he be able to furniſh out ſo ſtrict a demonſtration of that, which at beſt is, by his own conceſſion, but alluded to? Will it not be neceſſary to prove the reality of the alluſion, before it can be aſſumed as a foundation to ground a ſtrict mathematical concluſion upon? People may fancy references and alluſions, which never entered a writer's mind, and I know no one more likely

to

to be deluded by fancy than a perſon of ſo very impetuous zeal as appears in the performance in queſtion.

Where ſuppoſition is ſo freely indulged, one may, on the other ſide, venture to ſuppoſe, that, if the doctrine he eſpouſes were ſo neceſſary, as he would have it underſtood to be, to the exiſtence of a true Church, the Jews, in whoſe Scriptures it is not explicitly contained, where, as himſelf allows, it was impoſſible for them to find it, could not have been true worſhippers of God, and conſequently theirs not altogether a true church; in which caſe it would ſeem that God had indulged them with a revelation, that, for their own particular, ſtood them in no great ſtead.

This, however, is incredible; and it is ſtill more incredible that our Saviour himſelf ſhould communicate, as we know he did, with a church that worſhipped God erroneouſly, and never make one attempt to rectify the error: But it ſeems, it would have been utterly improper for him to impart to them any information of that ſort; becauſe, if they had known him to be the Supreme God, they would not have put him to death, and ſo his ſatisfaction to the Father's juſtice, and the redemption of the world, would have been prevented. Is it then credible, or indeed is it poſſible, that they

who

who would not believe him, when he assured them, by the most miraculous powers, that he was the messenger of God, would have believed him, if he had told them, what was infinitely more incredible, that he was the Supreme God himself? Such a declaration would have insured his crucifixion much more effectually: For if they considered it as so capital blasphemy to call himself the Son of God, certainly it must have appeared to be blasphemy of the most aggravated kind, if he had said that he was God himself; that God, whom they knew from their own Scriptures to be absolutely invisible. Thus Jesus Christ, according to this young man's theology, came into this world to teach true religion, and went out of it, leaving mankind at an utter loss with respect to the first and most fundamental principle of it, having, while he was in the world, countenanced error by his own example.

Was this matter, therefore, set right by the Apostles and inspired writers after him? Not so far as we know, except we take this gentleman's word, that they taught Athanasianism verbally, where they planted the Gospel, and thought it sufficient to hint at, or allude to it in their writings, which were composed for the instruction of all ages to come. This he says, and reduces us thereby to an evil situation indeed; for we have nothing to depend on but uncertain tradition, for the great,

the diſtinguiſhing doctrine of Chriſtianity, that awful particular of the faith, which, "whoſoever "would be ſaved, muſt keep whole and unde-"filed." If the Apoſtles were ſo negligent in this capital and characteriſtic principle of Goſpel-religion, what aſſurance can we have that they were not equally negligent in other points of leſs moment; and then how can we be certain that we have the religion taught by Chriſt and his Apoſtles in any degree of purity? May we not ſtill be in nearly as bad a ſtate, as before Chriſt's coming to eradicate error, and teach the true, the whole will of God? I can ſee no ſuccedaneum for the diligence and accuracy of the ſacred writers, but oral tradition; and at that opening Popery will enter with might and main, and lead us all in captivity to the Biſhop of Rome, and chain us for ever to his foot-ſtool. We ſhall in vain alledge our ſixth article for the ſufficiency of Scripture to ſalvation, becauſe here is a direct confeſſion, that, from the want of care, and indifference of the writers, the Scriptures are exceedingly deficient.

What a pity, that this thoughtleſs youth did not conſult ſome friend of maturer judgment; or if he did, that his ſeaſonable advice was over-ruled by his own ſelf-ſufficiency? If he had no friend of this kind to conſult, there are conſiderations, which even a giddy mind could hardly fail to ſug-

geſt,

geſt, that ought to have deterred him from the attempt of confuting the Apology. The honour of the eſtabliſhment was in queſtion; the foundations of the church, as a ſcriptural church, which reprobates every doctrine not taken immediately from the Bible, were ſtruck at; and, in the opinion of ſome people, a breach was made. Was it for a Stripling to ſtand forth a volunteer in the day of danger, and brandiſh his unaſſayed armour? The Veterans of Orthodoxy were called for, and no doubt were bringing up their artillery; but diſguſted by the alacrity of an interloper, or glad of a pretence to be excuſed from a ſervice, which they knew would require their utmoſt exertion, they ſtopped ſhort, and left the Apologiſt to the triumph of one, who ſhouted victory before he had made the ſmalleſt impreſſion on the object of his attack.

Hence the conſcientious *Seceder* has the honour to be yet in ſafe poſſeſſion of his principles, and the church, from which he *ſeceded*, lies under, perhaps, the unmerited diſgrace of being incapable of defence. Hence it happens, that his ſelf-delegated aſſailant, to whom unſubſtantial vapours floating in his brain are reaſons, "ſtrong as proofs of "holy writ," boaſts, that this nonſenſical propoſition, "that Jeſus Chriſt is one with the Father, "God," has been demonſtrated by him, from

holy Scripture, "*as* clearly as any propoſition in "the mathematical elements of Euclid *." With this boaſt in his mouth, he acknowledges, that in one part of Scripture it was impoſſible for thoſe, who were moſt concerned, to find it; that in another it was improper to be revealed; that where the evidence is greateſt, the fact is only preſumed by himſelf, not affirmed by the writers. Of ſuch materials, he tells us, his mathematical demonſtration is compoſed. Men of ordinary underſtanding, and cooler heads, will be at a loſs to know, how a ſort of certainty ſhould be in the concluſion, which is abſent from all the premiſes. But there are men of whom it is truly ſaid, *quicquid volunt, credunt*, and theſe men never meet with a difficulty in their ſpeculations, but they put it to flight with the greateſt facility.

We are told, indeed, that this demonſtration is not deducible from any particular part of Scripture, but reſults from the whole of it collectively. If in the later books of Scripture there had been but a ſingle text, expreſly affirming that "Jeſus "Chriſt is one with the Father, God," that three equal perſons are one God, this might have been a kind of pole-ſtar to direct our inquiries, and it might reaſonably have been preſumed that all the

* Page 192.

reſt

reſt pointed to it; but this not being the caſe, no man has a right to aſſume for the ſenſe of the Holy Spirit, that which the Holy Spirit himſelf does not acknowledge. But notwithſtanding his own declaration, that this mathematical demonſtration reſults only from "the whole Bible," and from "nothing leſs than the whole Bible," our extraordinary Logician, in direct contradiction to what he here ſays, has attempted to deduce the ſame concluſion from ſeveral ſcores of ſeparate texts, in every part of Scripture, and inſiſted, in language the moſt peremptory, that he has ſo deduced it. How he has ſucceeded in this attempt, will be ſeen in the following ſheets.

But before we turn to them, I muſt beg leave to introduce another curious conceit, which did not fall within my plan to be ſo fully noticed elſewhere. Though there was no abſolute neceſſity for uſing the terms "Trinity, and Trinity in Unity," to expreſs the myſtery of the Godhead, there was, it ſeems, a ſort of neceſſity of convenience, "to ſerve "the purpoſe of more expeditiouſly conveying "one's mind on the ſubject *." But why ſhould men be in more haſte to convey their ideas, than the Sacred Writers, who compoſed the books of Scripture, or the Holy Spirit, who ſuggeſted the

* Page 9.

matter? If their mind could be expeditiously enough conveyed, without theſe barbarous and ſcholaſtic terms, is this either more or leſs than telling them, that too much of the important time of ſuch conſequential gentlemen as our Layman, would be taken up by following them in their round-about track?

A modeſt man would have been extremely cautious of ſaying this, if it were but out of reverence of the Holy Spirit, who did not think his time miſemployed in delivering his meſſage as he received it from God; but there is another conſideration ſtill more urgent for this caution, and that is, that poſſibly the terms may not be exactly ſynonimous with the words of the Holy Spirit, that is, convey preciſely the meaning he intended. There is, indeed, great reaſon to ſuſpect they do not; nay it may ſeem to be a certainty that they do not clearly convey it, if one may venture to conclude only from that ſtrife, contention, bloodſhed, and utter extirpation of brotherly love, which the introduction of theſe terms, from their very firſt invention, occaſioned in the Chriſtian world, and which ſubſiſt, on the very ſame account, in different countries, in different degrees, to this day.

No believer ever doubted, that, what the Scriptures expreſly affirm of the perſon and nature of God,

God, was true; but thouſands and ten thouſands of pious and ſerious believers have entered their proteſt againſt this artificial theology, and ſealed their teſtimony by their blood, which at leaſt afforded an irrefragable proof of their ſincerity. Thus were Chriſtians divided into furious factions, and deſtroyed one another with the ferocity of Barbarians.

This could hardly have happened (for I inſiſt not here on the abſolute falſity of the Layman's propoſition) if the mind and will of God had been ſo evident on his ſide of the queſtion, as it ought to have been to juſtify the introduction of a new expreſſion of man's device. And, if the chance was ever ſo little, as indeed it was very great, that the new-invented terms might imply ſome deviation from the meaning of the Holy Spirit, in the ſame proportion was the danger, that he, who ſhould enforce the acceptance of them by human penalties, would become a preacher of *another Goſpel*, and ſubject himſelf to the curſe denounced by the great Apoſtle of the Gentiles. He therefore, who will venture on ſuch an expedient for propagating his own interpretations, ought to feel the ſtrongeſt conviction of mind, that he cannot be miſtaken.

God, who gave the faculties of one man, gave thoſe of another alſo; and has no where ſaid, that your underſtanding ſhould be in bondage to mine, nor mine to your's. On the contrary every man is commanded to examine for himſelf, to obey God rather than man, and *is to ſtand or fall to his own maſter*. And ſurely that is the will of God to me, which I find to be ſo, by the beſt exerciſe I can make of the underſtanding, which God has given me. It is neceſſary to ſalvation that I be fully perſuaded in my own mind, and it will not excuſe me, who am accountable for the employment of my own talents, that I ſuffer another, who has no ſuch authority from God, to obtrude on me his own, perhaps erroneous, perſuaſion.

What aſſurance, indeed, can any man have, that another has not examined the Holy Scriptures with as much impartiality and attention as himſelf? And ſhall he then turn downright Inquiſitor, and condemn his brother for not receiving his interpretation; which if he do receive, he muſt be condemned of God, who hath commanded him to ſearch the Scriptures for himſelf, and to be finally determined by what he ſhall find there written? Equal diligence and equal capacity being ſuppoſed, is not one man as liable to miſtake as another? And in this caſe, will not the probability be in favour of him, who has the feweſt and weakeſt temptations

temptations to bias his judgment, and influence his concluſions?

It will be hard perhaps to conceive any temptations of this kind in thoſe, who determine on the unpopular ſide, and conſequently relinquiſh all hopes of temporal encouragements, or advantages. If there are men, who not only ſuſpect, but even think they ſee with certainty the falſity of certain metaphyſical propoſitions, it would appear, even without examining the weight of Scripture-evidence in the oppoſite ſcale, to have been wrong to eſtabliſh them, and thereby fix terms of communion, which the Scriptures have not fixed. They who maintain ſuch propoſitions have a right to abound in their own ſenſe, and of this they will not be deprived, if our eccleſiaſtical conſtitution ſhould be once more brought back to the true principles of Proteſtantiſm, and ſettled on the foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets.

But we are told, that it was as free, and as harmleſs to invent and to uſe the terms Trinity, and Trinity in Unity *, as for the converts at Antioch to give themſelves the new name of Chriſtians. This appellation was intended to explain, and did explain, no doctrine of faith or practice;

* Page 10.

can

can the ſame be ſaid of the terms "Trinity, and Trinity in Unity?" If not, is not our Layman's illuſtration wholly impertinent? The Apoſtles certainly either would not have given their ſanction to a new term of ſuch importance, introduced by private Chriſtians, or if they had, ſuch ſanction would have proved its propriety. This is not the caſe with the terms in queſtion, and ſeeing the ſanction is wholly human, and the Church did well without them for near two hundred years, it may do as well without them at this day, except the Chriſtianity of modern times is not the Chriſtianity of antiquity.

But it ſeems, if we exclude theſe myſterious terms, we ſhall want words to expreſs the great *myſtery* of the Faith, and there are men to whom religion without myſtery would be a ſtrange phænomenon. To me, however, it would be a ſtranger, if there ſhould be any myſtery in a religion, which the God of all wiſdom ſent his Son to reveal, who likewiſe ſent the Holy Spirit to his immediate ſucceſſors, to lead them into all truth, from whom we have genuine records of all the doctrines of the one, and all the ſuggeſtions of the other. I could wiſh this warm Young Man to read a few pages of a late excellent publication, where he would find the meaning of the word Myſtery in the New Teſtament clearly explained.

I would

I would name the book, but he has ſo ſtrong an antipathy to the title, that it might poſſibly ſet him in a blaze, and I wiſh him to go cooly to the conſideration of the following Remarks. I will, however, venture to quote the Author's concluſion, as it follows from the faireſt premiſes. "From "all which it appears, that the word Myſtery in "the New Teſtament, means nothing more than "a *ſecret*; or a thing not underſtood. And in the "ſame manner, as the word *ſecret* is ſtill made "uſe of, after it is divulged; (as when we ſay the "*ſecret* is well known;) ſo the word Myſtery is "uſed to ſignify the doctrines of the Goſpel, even "after they had been publickly taught and ex-"plained, and conſequently, if we muſt not "ſearch into Myſteries, we muſt not endeavour "to underſtand the Goſpel." To theſe words I ſhall only add thoſe of the late amiable Foſter, as fully expreſſing my own ſentiments, "Where "*Myſtery* begins, *Religion* ends."

14 JY 60

REMARKS, &c.

SIR,

THE extraordinary reputation which your book ſpeedily obtained with readers of a particular complexion, raiſed in me a great curioſity to ſee what new light could be thrown on a ſubject which had ſo long employed the pens of the ableſt orthodox Divines, and which after all, appeared to me to be left in a ſtate of the greateſt perplexity. The Layman, it was ſaid, had removed all doubts, and given, from the Scriptures, a perfect demonſtration of the truth of Athanaſianiſm. I took up your work therefore with much prejudice in its favour; and though I did not hope to find, what was ſo much boaſted of, demonſtration, yet I expected much ingenuity of argument and criticiſm. I expected to ſee texts judiciouſly ſelected and compared, the context candidly examined, and ſome plauſibility at leaſt in the concluſion. But, alas, how was I diſappointed, when I found the contrary of all this; the Scriptures miſerably garbled, texts ſtrung together that

have no relation to each other, principles taken for granted that ought to have been proved, and proofs founded ſolely on falſe tranſlations, and falſe grammar!

I am willing to believe you to be ſerious, and you have certainly ſhewn your zeal: but probably the good woman *, who nurſed you, and gave you the firſt information on this ſubject, had as much zeal as yourſelf, and ſome people may ſuſpect as much knowledge; at leaſt ſhe gave you as good a proof as any you have produced, after all your labour and parade, "that Jeſus Chriſt is with the Father, one God †."

In order to clear the way for the ſort of proof you intended to bring, you have taken the trouble to write a chapter "on the province of reaſon, with reſpect to its enquiry into Scripture truths." Here, Sir, it muſt be acknowledged that you have ſhewn a prudent foreſight of that which was to follow: For, before that which proves nothing, can be admitted as a proof of ſomething, reaſon muſt be ſet aſide, and the human mind left deſtitute of all principles, of every faculty which ought to regulate its judgment and concluſions. Perſuade men once that they have no means of diſtinguiſhing

* Page 199. † Page 15.

truth

truth from falſhood, that they are utterly helpleſs in ſo important a caſe, and they will thankfully take your nurſe's word ‡ if ſhe inform them that fire is cold, ſnow hot, and graſs yellow. If however I had been of your counſel, I would have adviſed you for the ſake of truth, to have ſpared that pains, and to have given your readers Mr. Locke's chapter on much the ſame ſubject: It would have made an odd contraſt indeed with your following chapters, but you have not ſcrupled to diſtinguiſh your performance with as great inconſiſtencies; and, with regard to your readers, it might have made ſome of them underſtand, that they have a right to be treated as reaſonable creatures, and that abſurdity, even in matters of religion, is not capable of proof.

This chapter is laboured in ſo high a ſtrain of declamation, and you ſhed ſo thick and painful a vapour behind you, as you proceed, that the reader, who follows you, is obliged often to ſtop and rub his eyes, and look about for a glimpſe of light. And with what diſcovery is all this toil rewarded? He finds at laſt, that the purpoſe of all this rant and ſmoke was to teach him, that, in matters relating to the nature of God, he can have no information from his reaſon §, that it will here ſtand

‡ Page 199. § Page 23, or rather the whole chapter.

him in no kind of ſtead; that all propoſitions of this kind are, with reſpect to man's underſtanding, in themſelves equally probable and true.

This I take to be your meaning, when conceived in plain language; and if I do miſtake you, the blame, I think, is not wholly mine. If you are at all to be underſtood, you have delivered a doctrine which one would not have expected to hear from a profeſſor of Proteſtantiſm, in a Proteſtant country, and in this age of light and enquiry: It is indeed calculated ſolely for the meridian of Rome; without it Popery cannot ſtand a ſingle year; and if we admit it, we throw the gates of our Church wide open to receive Tranſubſtantiation, and all the concomitant abominations of idolatrous worſhip.

In fact, reaſon was the firſt vehicle of information from God to men; it is as truly his gift, as any verbal or written revelation he ever afterwards vouchſafed to mankind. If he be a God of truth therefore, he cannot contradict himſelf, nor, by a ſubſequent diſcovery of his will, confound thoſe truths which were received from him by a former communication. It may be true, and it certainly is true, "that reaſon cannot comprehend the infinite and incomprehenſible nature of God:" But does it follow, that, becauſe it cannot do all, it can do nothing? So far as it has clear, diſtinct, and

adequate

adequate conceptions, ſo far its deciſions are infallible; and it makes no difference, whether its object be things earthly, or things heavenly; the nature of God, or the nature of man.

The certainty ariſes not from the nature of the object under contemplation, but from the clear perception it has of the agreement, or diſagreement of its own ideas. Wherever it finds that, it finds certainty, and ſo far it may be ſafely truſted; nay, the man feels himſelf under a neceſſity of receiving or rejecting, whatever it thus legitimately decides, as aſſuredly true, or aſſuredly falſe. The Father and Giver of it, the gracious and wiſe God, has formed us entirely paſſive in the caſe; and truth, of whatſoever kind, clearly diſcerned, is the center, to which our aſſent is as forcibly impelled, as heavy matter towards the center of the earth.

Let us inſtance in a few propoſitions reſpecting the nature of God. Firſt then, when reaſon has once attained the knowledge of this truth, that there is but one Supreme God, (in whatever way it gained this knowledge, whether by purſuing its own reſearches, or by Divine Revelation) it infallibly decides, and it cannot do otherwiſe, not even ſuſpend its deciſion, that there are neither more, nor fewer, neither no God at all, nor yet three Supreme Gods,

Secondly;

Secondly; When it has once diſcovered, in whatever way, that the Supreme God is infinitely wiſe, juſt, and true, it determines abſolutely, that whoever is not infinitely wiſe, juſt, and true, is not Supreme God.

Thirdly; When it is once known, that the Supreme God is underived and ſelf-exiſtent, holding all his attributes by the neceſſity of his nature, and not at the pleaſure of any other; reaſon concludes with intuitive certainty, that whoever is not underived and ſelf-exiſtent, whoever receives his attributes from, and holds them at the pleaſure of another, is not Supreme God.

4. See add. at the end of the advertisement

If an Angel from Heaven ſhould teach the contrary of any of theſe concluſions, and though he ſhould work innumerable miracles, yet reaſon would reject his evidence as of one deceived, or deceiving; becauſe it would feel an irreſiſtible conviction, that what he taught was falſe: And if you, Sir, have taught doctrines equally incredible, reaſon will riſe up againſt you, and like neglected conſcience, aſſert its own rights, and condemn you, however you may flatter yourſelf you had lulled it to ſleep, or depoſed it from its ſovereignty.

Let us therefore examine your great propoſition, which you pretend to deduce ſo confidently from

ſo

ſo many texts, " that Jeſus Chriſt is with the Father, one God;" or, as you expreſs yourſelf in other places, " that Jeſus Chriſt is one with the Father, God;" or, " the Holy Ghoſt one with the Father and the Son, God*." With the firſt of theſe propoſitions you ſet out, and the ſecond and the third you have adopted in various parts of your book. Now, Sir, if you are to be underſtood as ſpeaking the common language of your country, you ought to mean, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt are but different names of one and the ſame perſon, and conſequently they muſt be one and the ſame God. This is the true, the only import of the Engliſh word *one*. If this were your meaning, you would be as arrant an Unitarian as the honeſt Apologiſt himſelf; with this difference however, that he, with the ſacred penmen, preſerves the diſtinction of perſons, and you, with the Heretic Sabellius, take it away.

But, though you have choſe to uſe the language of an Heretic, it appears from your whole book, that you mean no Hereſy; and particularly from the vehement declamation with which you defend the eſtabliſhed forms. I take it for granted therefore, that whatever induced you to depart from the language, your intention is to defend the doc-

* Page 209, and almoſt every page.

trine

trine of the Athanaſian Creed. By the words therefore of this Creed I muſt interpret yours; and ſuppoſe the burthen of all your arguments to be, that "the Father is God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghoſt God; and yet there are not three Gods, but one God." The ſame Creed informs us farther, that "the whole three Perſons are co-eternal together and co-equal," and that "each perſon is by himſelf God and Lord;" that is, if I have any conception of the meaning of the terms, that the Father is Supreme God, the Son Supreme God, and the Holy Ghoſt Supreme God; that there is a numerical and perſonal difference, and yet that they are all but one and the ſame Supreme God.

Now, Sir, human reaſon, the firſt ſource of knowledge planted by God in the mind of man, and which he could never afterwards contradict, informs me, that one Supreme God, and another Supreme God, and another Supreme God, are three Supreme Gods, and that three Supreme Gods cannot be one Supreme God; and therefore that it cannot be true, that all three are Supreme Gods, and yet that there is but one Supreme God. And the misfortune is, that reaſon teaches me this ſo authoritatively, that I cannot but acquieſce in her information; nay, that I feel in my own mind that ſhe teaches me truly.

In ſuch a dilemma, what ſolution ſhall I ſeek? You bid me renounce reaſon, and depend on revelation. But I know not what is revelation, otherwiſe than by the information of my reaſon; and ſhe informs me that this propoſition is falſe, by a much clearer evidence, than ſhe affords me of the exiſtence of any revelation whatever. Shall I therefore renounce the clearer, and be guided by the darker evidence? No; I will not do that; that would be to deſpiſe the moſt aſſured gift of God: I will not renounce my reaſon, but have conſulted revelation; and, thank God, find no ſuch propoſition, expreſſed or implied, from the firſt to the laſt chapter of it.

The teſtimony of the Holy Ghoſt, in the inſpired ſcriptures, is plain, poſitive, and uniform, that there is but *one living and true God*, and that the Father is he. This truth is repeatedly delivered in terms, that abſolutely exclude the Son by name, firſt by St. John recording the words of Chriſt himſelf, *that they might know thee the only true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent* *; and again by St. Paul, *there is but one God, the Father, and one Lord, Jeſus Chriſt* †. Again; our Saviour affirms of himſelf, *My Father is greater than I* ‡. *Of that day and that hour knoweth no*

* John xvii. 3. † 1 Cor. viii. 6. ‡ John xiv. 28.

man,

man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father *. *Then cometh the end when he ſhall have delivered up the kingdom* (which he had received) *to God, even the Father—for he* (God) *hath put all things under his feet. But when he ſaith all things are put under him, it is manifeſt that he is excepted that did put all things under him; and when all things ſhall be ſubdued unto him, then ſhall the Son alſo himſelf be ſubject unto him, that put all things under him; that God may be all in all* †.

Does not the laſt quoted paſſage aſſert, that the Son received the kingdom from the Father, who is excluſively ſtiled God; and that he muſt, at the conſummation of all things, reſign his powers to God, who gave them? Is it poſſible that the Son ſhould receive the kingdom from himſelf, and reſign it to himſelf? And, if he received it from another, and reſigned it to another; is not that other, from whom he received it, and whoſe ſubject he is at laſt to become, his ſuperior; as St. Paul aſſerts he was during his whole adminiſtration, when he obſerves *that he is excepted that did put all things under him?*

In conformity to this idea, of his owing the kingdom to the Father's appointment, our Savi-

* Mark xiii. 31. † 1 Cor. xv. 24. &c.

our himſelf, in the moſt ſolemn act of ſovereignty he ſhall ever exerciſe, the judgment of the laſt day, and the final ſentence to be pronounced, acknowledges himſelf the diſpenſer of the Father's mercies. *Come*, ſays he to the righteous, *ye bleſſed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the beginning of the world* *. If the gracious deſign of giving everlaſting life to good men originated equally from the whole Trinity, if our Saviour was equally the delegate of the whole, it is inconceivable that he ſhould cloſe his commiſſion by requiring from them a recognition of the Father's goodneſs only. Where equal obligation is conferred, equal gratitude is due.

The texts juſt quoted, are indeed ſo poſitive in their teſtimony for the ſole ſupremacy of the Father, that language affords not terms more deciſive. In anſwer to theſe, what do you produce? You have ranſacked the ſacred pages almoſt from end to end; and yet you have not produced one text, or ſcrap of a text, which affirms that the Father is not the one true God; that the Son is the one true God; that he was any thing, which the Father did not make him, or poſſeſſed any powers which the Father did not give him. All that you have done is by way of interpretation and

* Mat. xxv. 34.

inference, and how lame you are in theſe will appear by and by.

That God promiſed to bring about a particular event, and that that event was finally accompliſhed by the Son, is no proof of the Son's ſupreme and independent Divinity. It proves indeed, and this is all it can prove, that the Son was the Father's inſtrument, who accompliſhed the event by his mediation.

That Jeſus Chriſt worked miracles, raiſed the dead, forgave ſins, ſhall judge the world, and give everlaſting life, if he poſſeſſed theſe powers in his own proper and underived right, might ſeem to be ſomething to your purpoſe. But is it not aſtoniſhing, that, when you read ſuch declarations as theſe, you ſhould pay no attention to thoſe draw-backs, with which they are qualified, and rendered utterly inadequate to your concluſion? Such as, *My Father is greater than I* *; *the Son can do nothing of himſelf* †; *the Father hath committed all judgment to the Son; hath given to the Son to have life in himſelf; I can of my own ſelf do nothing; the works which the Father hath given me to finiſh* ‡, *I can do nothing of myſelf, but as the Father hath*

* John xiv. 28. † John v. 19. ‡ Ibidem 22, 26, 30, 36.

taught

taught me, I ſpeak theſe things *; *the Father which ſent me, gave me commandment, what I ſhould ſay, and what I ſhould ſpeak* †; *as the Father gave me commandment, even ſo I do* ‡; *it pleaſed the Father that in him ſhould all fullneſs dwell* §; *God giveth not the Spirit by meaſure unto him* ‖.

Now, if the Father was greater than the Son; if the Son could do nothing of himſelf; if he held the judgment by the Father's commiſſion, and life as the Father's gift; if the Father appointed the works he was to finiſh, and taught and commanded him what he ſhould ſpeak, and what he ſhould do; if the fullneſs that was in him, depended on the Father's pleaſure, and he was not qualified for his high office, without an immeaſurable portion of the Holy Spirit; what is the fair inference from all this; Not ſurely, that he was the Supreme God, of whom not one of theſe, or ſimilar propoſitions, would be true; but that he was the Father's meſſenger and miniſter; that, whatever mighty works diſtinguiſhed his miniſtration, they were all the effects of the Father's power acting in him, and by him: Or, if you pleaſe, that he was *ſanctified and ſent by the Father*.

* John viii. 28. † John xii. 49. ‡ John xiv. 31.
§ Col. i. 19. ‖ John iii. 34.

Again;

Again; The magnificent titles with which he is inveſted, the high honours ordained for him in heaven and in earth, ſhall be allowed to prove, that he is a moſt ſtupendouſly glorious Being; *that the Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand* *; but we muſt ſtop ſhort of abſolute Godhead, when we read ſuch paſſages as the following. *God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name, which is above every name, that at the name of Jeſus every knee ſhould bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue ſhould confeſs, that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord, to the glory of God the Father* †.

In God, the ſupreme and ſelf-exiſtent God, we know from revelation as well as reaſon, that there is *no variableneſs, neither ſhadow of turning* ‡. It is impoſſible therefore, that the ſupreme, ſelf-exiſtent God ſhould either be abaſed (as St. Paul, in the preceding verſes, informs us Jeſus Chriſt was) or exalted. And what is the more remarkable, he aſſumed not this ſuper-eminent degree of exaltation to himſelf, but God exalted him, in reward of his perſonal merits, under the reſtriction, *that every tongue ſhould confeſs that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.*

* John iii. 35. † Phil. ii. 9, 11. ‡ James i. 17.

Is

Is not one of theſe glorious Beings manifeſtly inferior to the other? Can it be God, who gave, or Chriſt, who received; the Son who is appointed to ſo high honours; or the Father, who in the formal act of inveſtiture, has made a reſerve of his own pre-eminence, and conditioned that theſe honours ſhall ultimately be referred to his own glory?

Theſe few plain texts, and plain remarks, I am perſuaded, are ſufficient to give a compleat defeat to that hoſt of ſhreds and patches which you have arrayed, with ſo formidable an appearance, under your banners; and if the matter were to be decided by plain common ſenſe, I ſhould think it unneceſſary to give you further trouble. But a ſtaunch Athanaſian is not ſo eaſily to be conquered; he has as many ſhifts as a weather-beaten fox; he varies ſhapes with the dexterity of a Proteus; and, though he has the words Hereſy and Heretics perpetually in his mouth, there is not an Heretic of them all, of ever ſo odious name, or odious tenets, whoſe ſemblance he deigns not to aſſume, when he is pinched by a capable adverſary, or the intereſt of the cauſe requires it. When the firſt is no longer for his purpoſe, he ſlips into a ſecond, or a third; and when ſtripped of that, reſumes his original ſhape, and boldly claims the ground from which he had been fairly driven.

To juſtify this repreſentation, I need but appeal to your own conduct. At your ſetting out, your language and your features were downright Sabellian, and ſome attention was neceſſary to ſee through the diſguiſe. At page 201, you figure in the garb and enſigns of a Tritheiſt, or maintainer of three equal Gods. For there we read this very extraordinary remark; 'as to this aſſer-'tion,' "that we who join in the four invocations, "at the beginning of the Litany, can be ill de-"fended againſt the charge of holding four Gods, "to wit, the Father, the Son, and the Holy "Ghoſt, and the Trinity;" 'it is about as wiſely 'put, as if we ſhould ſay, that the government at 'Rome was adminiſtered not by three, but by four 'men, to wit, Octavius, Lepidus, Anthony and the 'Triumvirate.' Now, either there is ſome analogy between the terms Triumvirate and Trinity, or there is not. If not, you have mocked your readers with mere idle ſounds. This ſurely you could not mean to do. There muſt therefore be ſome analogy; and that analogy can lie in nothing but this, that as the term Triumvirate ſtands for the idea of three men, numerically and ſubſtantially diſtinct, exerciſing a joint and equal authority; ſo the term Trinity conveys the idea of three Gods, numerically and ſubſtantially diſtinct, in the exerciſe of equal powers and dominion. And if the Father be God, numerically and

ſubſtan-

ſubſtantially diſtinct from the Son, the Son from the Holy Ghoſt, and the Holy Ghoſt from both, there will then be three equal Gods, as certainly as Octavius, Anthony, and Lepidus were three men: And if this is not, what is Tritheiſm? But this illuſtration is moſt unfortunate in another reſpect; it bears not the ſmalleſt reſemblance to the point you would illuſtrate. To make it pertinent, it ought to have been ſaid, that Octavius was a man, Lepidus a man, Anthony a man, and yet all three conjoined—a man; and if you had put it thus, you would have left Mr. Lindſey and Dr. Clarke in full poſſeſſion of their conſequence: For he who can count to four, would find the Triumvirate to have been a fourth man.

Thus you are by turns a Sabellian, and a Tritheiſt; ſometimes a ſtrict Unitarian, and ſometimes declaiming loudly for the doctrine of three equal Gods. But at the preſent pinch Sabellianiſm and Tritheiſm will do nothing for you. They afford no anſwer to ſo many plain texts of Scripture, that ſo poſitively aſſert the Father's ſuperiority, and the inferiority of the Son. What therefore is to be done? Why, there is another claſs of Heritics, whoſe peculiar error it is to divide Chriſt; to conſider him not as one individual perſon, but as two. According to theſe, there was

a Chriſt, who came down from heaven, and was God; and a Chriſt, who was born of the Virgin, and was man.

Now, here is the very thing you want; "The "man Chriſt Jeſus, you ſay *, was inferior to "God; that is having two natures, one was "greater, and conſequently one leſs than the "other." When therefore the Scriptures ſpeak of his inferiority to the Father, we muſt underſtand them as ſpeaking of his "leſs nature," that is, as of mere man. But the queſtion is not whether he had two natures, but whether he had two perſons. If he had two perſons, (which you muſt mean, if you mean to help yourſelf out of the difficulty) then you are no longer an Athanaſian, or Sabellian, but a Cerinthian: If he had but one perſon, then whatever is ſaid of Chriſt, muſt be underſtood of but one perſon, and that one perſon muſt be inferior to the Father, except one and the ſame perſon could be inferior, and not inferior to one and the ſame Father.

Your two natures therefore are, in your apprehenſion, two perſons; and this is all the anſwer you vouchſafe to give to all that weight of evidence, by which his abſolute inferiority may ſeem

* Layman, page 17.

to

to be proved. This is not only all you do ſay, but all you can ſay; and a wretched all it is. For, even granting that you have ſome fetch in your own mind, by which you perſuade yourſelf, that, when you ſpeak of the two natures of Chriſt, you mean not two perſons; yet you muſt mean at leaſt, that the perſonal pronouns, I, Thou, He, are frequently ſpoken not of whole Chriſt, but of a very inconſiderable part of him. This is a conceit which abſolutely deſtroys all certainty in language; and what is worſe, it is a mere gratis dictum, a direct begging of the queſtion. For you have not produced, you cannot produce one word of Scripture, not the moſt diſtant innuendo, that the perſon of Chriſt is not one undivided, and indiviſible perſon; that whatever is affirmed of him, is not affirmed of whole Chriſt, of that Son of God who came down from heaven, was made fleſh, died and roſe again, and was by the Father made *both Lord and Chriſt*.

The Scriptures will not help you out, but you will help yourſelf. The intereſts of the cauſe were all at ſtake: For without this ſhift, Athanaſianiſm is gone for ever. It is but boldly affirming, and the neceſſity muſt juſtify the venture. Such are the miſerable conſequences, when human authority invades God's province, and erects a tribunal to controul the wiſdom of the Holy Spirit.

Error is eſtabliſhed, and perhaps in no long time detected. It is not however renounced; that would diſgrace the authority that ſet it up. The ſame authority goes to work again therefore, and hopes to ſalve the former error by a ſecond deciſion; it decides erroneouſly a ſecond time, and thus error was propagated upon error in the Chriſtian world to ſo an enormous a degree, that, for ſeveral ſucceſſive ages, Paganiſm itſelf wore as fair a face as Chriſtianity.

Seeing therefore you can produce no Scripture to prove, that Chriſt is ever ſpoken of as two perſons, or that his whole perſon is not meant in every paſſage, where he is named; I will produce two texts, which, in my opinion, demonſtrably prove his inferiority to the Father, even in his greater nature, as you chooſe to ſpeak, or as he is God.

The firſt is John v. 19. *The Son can do nothing of himſelf, but what he ſeeth the Father do.* Not to mention the abſurdity of the ſuppoſition, that Chriſt came down from heaven to teach men ſo well known a truth, as that mere man cannot work miracles, Son and Father here muſt be reciprocal terms; and therefore Son cannot mean Son of man, or man, but the Son of God, or Chriſt in his greater nature; or as the Pſeudo-Athanaſius expreſſes

preſſes it, " God of the ſubſtance of the Father, " begotten before the worlds; not man of the ſub- " ſtance of his mother born in the world." If therefore Chriſt in his greater nature, or in the language of you and Athanaſius, as he was God, could do nothing of himſelf, but as he was enabled by the Father, Chriſt in his greater nature was inferior to the Father.

The other text is, Mark xiii. 32. *Of that day, and that hour knoweth no man, no not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.* Surely a divine revelation was not neceſſary to prove, that mere man did not know the day of judgment. This was as certainly known before, as it could be ſince our Saviour's appearance. Father and Son therefore muſt again be reciprocal terms, and the ſame concluſion follows. If you ſay, after all, that poſſibly Son may mean Son of man, or Jeſus Chriſt in his " leſs nature;" I inſiſt that it is a doctrine of Athanaſianiſm, that he was the Son of the Father before he was born into the world, and that, if he had never been born, he would notwithſtanding have been a Son: Elſe what will become of the eternal generation?

Conſider the fact therefore in this light, could he, in his " greater" nature, of himſelf perform miraculous works; or did he know that day and hour?

hour? If he could do the one, and knew the other; he could do the one, and knew the other only as a Son; for he was always a Son. Could he therefore truly ſay, in the former caſe, that the *Son* could do nothing; and in the latter, that the *Son* knew not the day and hour, but the *Father* only; when at the ſame time, it might with the utmoſt certainty have been affirmed, that the *Son* could do every thing, and knew every thing as well as the Father himſelf? Such equivocation could come with little propriety from the mouth of the Son of God, and it is with as little decency forced upon him by the whole tribe of Athanaſians. This indeed is moſt inconſiſtent with their own principles, but conſiſtency and orthodoxy are not always at accord.

You have had an uneaſy time, I know well enough, among your Cerinthian allies; but you dare not leave them yet: If you have any hope, it depends entirely on them. I ſhall find you by and by at your proper poſt, and, when it is your cue, maintaining the Unity of Chriſt's perſon, as firmly as the Unity of his Godhead with the Father. In the mean time you muſt allow me to keep poſſeſſion of your own camp, and turn its deſerted artillery upon you.

Neque

Neque Lex eſt juſtior ulla,
Quam necis artifices arte perire ſuâ.

Take your Common Prayer-book therefore, and behold what the counterfeit Athanaſius teaches to all his diſciples: "Though he (Chriſt) be God "and man, yet he is not two, but one Chriſt: One "altogether," that is, in the ſtricteſt ſenſe of unity. Again; "as the reaſonable ſoul and fleſh is one "man, ſo God and man is one Chriſt;" that is, as really one perſon, as the reaſonable ſoul and fleſh is one perſon. I aſk therefore, could one and the ſame perſon both know and not know the ſame thing at the ſame time? Did our Saviour really know the day and hour in his "greater" nature, which now united to his "leſs" made together with it one perſon, as truly as the united body and ſoul of man are one perſon, when he ſo ſolemnly aſſures his diſciples he knew it not? A witneſs in a court of juſtice delivering ſuch an evidence would be indicted of perjury, and an honeſt jury would convict him, notwithſtanding the miſerable quibble, if he ſhould dare to alledge it, that his fleſh was really ignorant, though his reaſonable ſoul knew well enough.

Shall we not ſhudder to put a ſort of language in the mouth of the meſſenger of the God of truth, nay, as you call him, the God of truth himſelf, which would bring a frail mortal to condign puniſhment?

niſhment? This ſingle conſideration is wont to affect me ſo forcibly, that I can hardly forbear to weep, when I hear ſerious and well-diſpoſed Chriſtians talk of their holy Redeemer, of the bleſſed Son of him *who hateth a lie*, in a ſtrain ſo exceedingly groſs and blaſphemous. Pardon the ſeverity of the expreſſion: the vaſt importance of the ſubject extorted it from me; and I cannot retract it, while I am convinced that the preaching of Chriſtianity muſt for ever be ineffectual for the general converſion of mankind, ſo long as it is exhibited in a form ſo revolting to common ſenſe; and its powers enfeebled, or rather ſmothered and extinguiſhed, beneath a maſs of human inventions, defended by palpable contradictions and abſurdity. Not one Jew, not one Mahometan, in ſuch circumſtances, can become a Chriſtian; hardly a Pagan will exchange idolatry for a ſyſtem, that looks at him with ſo diſtorted and deformed a viſage.

On ſuch pitiful ſophiſtry the whole of your ſyſtem is founded; on a kind of ſophiſtry, that admits of ſo eaſy, ſo full, and, if I may be allowed to ſay it, in my judgment, ſo unanſwerable a confutation. For if there is no authority of Scripture for dividing the perſon of Chriſt; if there is but a ſingle text, that exhibits him, in his "greater nature," as you affect to ſpeak, as inferior to the Father, your whole reaſoning is overthrown, and

muſt

muſt paſs away like the baſeleſs fabric of a viſion. Such texts, I think, I have produced, plain, poſitive, and incapable of other interpretation. If there are others therefore, that at firſt ſight ſeem to look a different way, Scripture cannot contradict itſelf, and the leſs clear muſt give way to the more clear: In fact, there is not one text, in which Jeſus Chriſt is mentioned, even in his higheſt ſtate of glory, but is capable of an eaſy reconciliation with this his own poſitive aſſertion, *My Father is greater than I;* while itſelf is utterly irreconcileable with the idea of his equality or ſameneſs with God the Father.

You muſt be ſenſible, one would ſuppoſe, that at leaſt you have been playing on the brink of an abſurdity; that if your ſyſtem is true, it is the moſt aſtoniſhing, nay, in itſelf, the moſt incredible, that ever was preſented to the human mind. This might have taught you ſome modeſty and diffidence; but aſſured of your own abilities, and ſwollen with imaginary infallibility, you have exhibited a ſpecimen of hardineſs, (I mean to ſpeak charitably when I call it hardineſs) ſuch as perhaps was never before equalled. Here are your words.

" Either Jeſus Chriſt is one with the Father,
" God, or he is not; either the Holy Ghoſt is one
" with the Father and the Son, God, or he is not.

" On ſuppoſing that the negative ſide of this di-
" lemma can be aſſumed, (and for argument's ſake
" it muſt be ſuppoſed, however irkſome) a conſe-
" quence enſues, horrible to thought. The God
" of peace becomes a firebrand of contention, ten-
" fold confuſion proceeds from God, *who is not*
" *the author of confuſion; the ſpirit of truth is a lyar;*
" the ſimple and guileleſs zeal of the Apoſtles, is
" crafty and deſigning duplicity; the wiſdom of
" God, folly, beneath the fooliſhneſs of men; and
" the revelation of the God of truth, from end to
" end, ſcarce the word of deſigning falſhood, it
" muſt have proceeded from a dupe to his own
" artifices *."

Pray, good Sir, moderate your wrath, and hear a word for the defendants. Either it was the will of God, that all honeſt, and ſerious, and capable enquirers ſhould find theſe propoſitions indiſputably revealed, or it was not. If ſuch were his will, all ſuch enquirers would certainly find them: but all honeſt, and ſerious, and capable enquirers have not found theſe propoſitions indiſputably revealed; and therefore the other ſide of the dilemma is certainly true, and it was not his will that all ſuch enquirers ſhould ſo find them. But what then? God has given ſuch a revelation as he knew

* Layman, page 229.

would

would beſt anſwer his gracious purpoſe of bringing good men to everlaſting life, and no particular harm has been done to you. If you like not revelation as it is, you are not obliged to receive it; why therefore ſhould you ſo outrageouſly

"Cry havoc, and let looſe the dogs of war?"

Why ſhould you pour out a torrent of foul language againſt the venerable Apoſtles, for recording faithfully the ſuggeſtions of the Holy Spirit, and againſt the Holy Spirit, and againſt God, for doing what was propereſt, and wiſeſt, and beſt?

But you proceed, "I ſhudder as I write;" and well you may.—But I have done with remarks, except that ſuch hot, burning zeal is no proper diſpoſition of mind for ſtudying the religion of the meek and humble Jeſus, nor indeed for the diſcovery of truth in general, which requires a ſteady, peaceable, and calm attention. I will add, that perhaps a cautious man would not think more favourably of a doctrine, that was not found by Newton, Locke, Clarke, and a long liſt beſides of the ableſt enquirers; men, to whom Chriſtianity owes the moſt eſſential ſervices, who were burning and ſhining lights, and with reſpect to whom the Layman ſtands at an immenſe diſtance.

Before I proceed to conſider your texts, I muſt be allowed to quote another paſſage, which, though

in a different way, is full as extraordinary as the preceding; and at the ſame time I ſhall take the liberty to contraſt with it a few verſes of Holy Scripture.

Thus ſpeaks Paganiſm and Popery by the pen of the Layman, page 150.

" The goodneſs of " God, and that gra- " cious indulgence with " which he has conſulted " the infirmities of our " ſtate, is in this reſpect " alſo very ſtrongly diſ- " played, that he took " manhood on him, in " order to give a *ſenſible* " *object of worſhip* to man- " kind, incapable of " forming any adequate " idea of the abſtract " God, whoſe qualities " are of a nature incom- " prehenſible by our " minds. The world " merged in Idolatry at " the time of his incar- " nation,

Thus ſpeaks true religion by the mouth of Moſes, the Prophet of God. Deut. chap. 4.

The Lord ſpake unto you out of the midſt of the fire; ye heard the voice of the words, but ſaw no ſimilitude; only ye heard a voice. Verſe 12.

Take ye therefore good heed unto yourſelves, (for ye ſaw no manner of ſimilitude on the day that the Lord ſpake unto you, in Horeb, out of the midſt of the fire) leſt you corrupt yourſelves, and make you a graven image, the ſimilitude of any figure, the likeneſs of male or female, the likeneſs of any beaſt that is on the earth, the likeneſs of any winged fowl that flieth

in

" nation, was mercifully
" indulged with an *ob-*
" *ject of ſenſe*—to whom
" even by the exertion
" of the ſame faculties by
" which they had adopt-
" ed and adored Idols,
" they could *prefer wor-*
" *ſhip*, without the im-
" putation of Idolatry."

in the air, the likeneſs of any thing that creepeth on the ground, the likeneſs of any thing that is in the waters under the earth. Verſes 16, 17, 18.

Now, Sir, I begin with your texts; but ſhall examine comparatively very few; both becauſe it would be endleſs to trace you through all your windings, through all your wreſtings and torturings of Scripture, and becauſe, what I have before advanced, contains, in my judgment, a full and ſatisfactory anſwer to all you have alledged. Such therefore only I ſhall attend to, as either look with ſome face of importance on your ſide, or are diſtinguiſhed by your very extraordinary application.

Page 54. " Thy kingdom come," Matth. vi. 10. " Thine is the kingdom, and the power and the " glory, for ever and ever. Amen." Matth. vi. 13.

Theſe words are part of the Lord's prayer, of that prayer, which our Saviour taught his Diſciples on a very particular occaſion, when they intreated

treated his information, how they ought to pray; and you move heaven and earth to prove this prayer to be addreſſed to the Son. The firſt words of it are theſe, *Our Father which art in heaven.* The perſon therefore, to whom it is addreſſed, was then in heaven. But are you ſure the Diſciples knew the Son to be in heaven at the time, or that he really was in heaven? He took much pains to teach them the contrary. He told them, *that he came down from heaven* *; *that he was come from God* †; *that he came forth from the Father, and came into the world* ‡; that as he came from God, *he was to go to God* §; *that he was to go to the Father* ‖; that he was to leave the world, and go to the Father **; *to aſcend to his Father, and their Father, to his God, and their God* ††; that he was to aſcend up where he was before ‡‡. Did he ever tell them that, notwithſtanding all this, he was ſtill in heaven? Or if he was all this time ſtill in heaven, what occaſion could he have to aſcend up where he was before, that is, to return to the very place which he had never left? You will not ſay, that his human nature had ever been in heaven, or that it could return where it had never been. If therefore the Son was not at this time in heaven, the Son could not be the perſon to whom this prayer is addreſſed.

* John vi. 38. † John xiii. 3. ‡ John xvi. 28.
§ John xiii. 3. ‖ John xiv. 28. ** John xvi. 28.
†† John xx. 17. ‡‡ John vi. 62.

It

It is impoſſible to ſay, what a diſputant of your peculiar caſt may chooſe to reply at ſuch a pinch. One may conjecture however, that you would quote John iii. 13. *No man hath aſcended up to heaven, but he who came down from heaven, even the Son of man, who is in heaven.* If you ſhould, I would reſtore conſiſtency to the text, by rectifying the tranſlation, and reading, *The Son of Man, who was in heaven.* The Greek is ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ ἐρανῷ, and it is reaſonable ſurely to give it that meaning, which alone can make ſenſe of the paſſage, and ſet Scripture at accord with Scripture. For the participle ὢν is indifferent to the paſt and preſent time. That the participle is capable of this rendering, you may have demonſtration by John ix. 25, *He anſwered and ſaid, whether he be a ſinner or no, I cannot tell. One thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I ſee,* ὅτι τυφλὸς ὢν ἄρτι βλέπω. The ſame participle ὢν is rendered, in the two different texts, by the two different Engliſh words *is* and *was;* for what reaſon the tranſlators know beſt: For in both, the verb *was* is equally neceſſary to the ſenſe; and it is equally impoſſible that a perſon ſhould at the ſame time be in the place from which he had deſcended, and that he who ſees ſhould be blind *.

* For this meaning of the participle ὢν ſee John i. 18.—xix. 38. 2 Cor. viii. 9.

But

But at all events, this prayer muſt be addreſſed to the Son. Now, Sir, we will examine your reaſons. They muſt have extraordinary weight, if they ſupport ſo extraordinary a concluſion. Why, at the end of it you read the word kingdom, and the word glory; and you likewiſe read in the Holy Scriptures of the kingdom and glory of the Son. But did you never read of the kingdom and glory of the Father; of a kingdom and glory given by the Father to the Son; of *the Father who loved the Son, and gave all things into his hand?* Do you not even quote a Scripture, that mentions the kingdom of Chriſt and of God? If therefore the Father had a kingdom and glory of his own, and the Son had neither, but as he received them from the Father; how will it follow, that the kingdom and glory, at the concluſion of the prayer, means the ſubordinate and commiſſionary kingdom of the Son, and not the original, undelegated, underived ſupremacy of the Father? Is the Son once mentioned in the whole? No; but Son and Father in your Divinity are ſynonymous terms. Away with ſuch illuſion! When God Almighty condeſcended to reveal his will to mankind, he certainly applied the terms of human language in the very ſenſe that gave them currency among men: Otherwiſe he could not have made himſelf at all underſtood, without another revelation to explain his terms; he would have talked a jargon,

that

that would have conveyed no more meaning than the language of Otaheite to an European. Father therefore in his language cannot mean Son, nor Son Father. Ex uno diſce omnes.

Page 58. "Who can forgive ſins, but God "alone?" None, by a primary right; but the Son of man alſo received power from God to forgive them.

Page 66. "Jeſus ſaid unto them before Abra-"ham was, I am." John viii. 58.

It is not eaſy to find out what you mean to make of this expreſſion, *I am*; whether you have determined to conſider it as an ordinary verb, or the proper name of God. If you take it for a proper name, you repreſent our Saviour as giving juſt as intelligible an anſwer to the queſtion, whether he had ſeen Abraham, as if he had ſaid, John, or Thomas. If you allow it to be a verb, I allow it to be of the preſent tenſe; but the context requires, that it here have a paſt ſignification; and then all will be rational and intelligible, literally thus, I was, before Abraham was born, πριν Αβρααμ γενεσθαι. And there is no myſtery in this. It is a well-known maxim in grammar, that the *preſent* tenſe is a tenſe of all times; and any little boy will inform you, that he cannot proceed

through many pages together of a Claſſic author, without finding the neceſſity of applying it. Accept of a few inſtances in either language.

" Cratera antiquum, quem *dat* Sidonia Dido." An ancient goblet, which Queen Dido *gives*— Though Dido was dead and reduced to aſhes long before this time *.

Ποτερα δ' 'ν οἰκοις, ἡ 'ν ἀγροῖς ὁ Λαΐος,
Ἡ γῆς ἐπ ἀλλης τῶδε συμπιπτει φόνῳ †.

The Greek verb συμπιπτει is of the preſent tenſe, and yet expreſſes a fatal accident, that had happened to Laius ſo long before, that his widow had married, and had had ſeveral children by her ſecond huſband, before the time of ſpeaking this.

Ω μη 'στι δρῶντι ταρβος, ϑδ' ἐπος φοβεῖ ‡. Him; who *was* not afraid to commit the fact, words *will* not terrify.

Οὐ γαρ ἐστι χείριστον ἀυτῶν ἐκ τῦ παρεληλυθοτος χρονυ, τυτο προς τα μελλοντα βελτιστον ὑπαρχει §. What *was* the worſt circumſtance in our affairs in

* Virg. Æn. 9. 266. † Soph. Ædi. Ty. 112.
‡ Soph. ibidem 304. § Philip. prima Mounteney's edition.

time

time paſt, bears the moſt hopeful aſpect with regard to futurity. It was thus underſtood by the Scholiaſt; ὁ ὑμας ἐκ τῦ παρεληλυθοτος ἐβλαψε χρονυ, that which prejudiced your affairs in time paſt: And thus alſo Demoſthenes explains himſelf, το χειριστον ἐν τοις παρεληλυθοσι, τυτο προς τα μελλοντα βελτιστον ὑπαρχει *

In the following quotation from the ſame Orator, the preſent muſt be put for the future tenſe; becauſe he is ſpeaking of the conſequences of a regulation he had juſt propoſed. Ἐξεστιν ἀγειν ἡσυχιαν; οἰκοι μενων ει βελτιων, τῦ δι' ἐνδειαν ἀναγκη τι ποιειν αἰσχρον ἀπηλλαγμενος. Συμβαινει τι τοιυτον οἱον και ταυῦν †; *Shall* there be no occaſion to take the field? While you continue at home, you *will* be a more reſpectable perſon, being freed from the temptation of poverty to commit a baſe action. *Shall* any conjuncture like the preſent fall out? &c.

It is exceeding common with the Comic writers to put the preſent tenſe to expreſs both paſt and future time; and therefore it may be preſumed that ſuch a practice was not unuſual in familiar converſation. Thus Terence ‡ Cum inde *abeo*,

* Vide notas in Philip. primam page 215. † Page 107. of the ſame edition. ‡ Eunu. Act 4th. Scene 4th.

jam tum inceperat turba inter eos. When I *came* away, a quarrel was begun between them. And again *; Thra. Quid *agimus*? Gna. Quin redeamus. What *ſhall* we do? Let us even march back.

Page 67. "I and my Father are one." John x. 30.

In the original it is ἓν, not εἷς, one thing, not one God. And our Saviour explains his own meaning very fully, where he makes this prayer, *Holy Father, keep through thine own name thoſe whom thou haſt given me, that they may be one, as we are; that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee; that they alſo may be one in us, that the world may know that thou haſt ſent me;—that they may be one, even as we are one;—that they may behold my glory which thou haſt given me* †. Do you not know that this very anſwer has been given a thouſand times; that it has never been refuted; that, if it be capable of refutation, you ought to have done your cauſe that ſervice, before you had alledged this text, which our Saviour himſelf ſo ſtrongly intimates to be impertinent?

* Act 4th. Scene 7th. † John xvii. 11. 22. 24.

Page 89. "The grace of God, who hath to "the Gentiles alſo granted repentance unto life. "Acts xi. 14 &c. But we believe, that through "the grace of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt we ſhall be "ſaved. Acts xv. 11. Here the grace of the "Lord Jeſus, and of God, are one and the ſame."

No wonder: For the Lord Jeſus is the miniſter and diſpenſer of the grace of God; and he would not diſpenſe faithfully, if he diſpenſed any other grace, which he had not received.

Page 94. "In the Acts, St. Luke ſays, that be- "cauſe Paul preached Jeſus to the Athenians, they "ſaid he ſeemed to be a ſetter-forth of *ſtrange* "*Gods*. Acts xvii. 18.—Here, upon a call to ex- "plain himſelf, and anſwer the charge of ſetting "forth *ſtrange Gods*, in having preached Jeſus, he "avows, that he whom he had preached was that "God whom they knew not, (the unknown "God) but worſhipped ignorantly: but he had "preached Jeſus; therefore Jeſus Chriſt was that "God hitherto unknown to them, and one with "the Father."

Really, Sir, this is a moſt ingenious argument, and wants nothing but truth in the premiſes to ſupport the concluſion. The whole of it, ſuch as it is, depends on a ſuppoſition, that the terms

ſtrange

ſtrange Gods and *unknown God*, relate to the ſame perſon; (and what will not a bigotted Athanaſian ſuppoſe, when he hopes to ſerve his hypotheſis?) but this ſuppoſition will be found totally void of foundation. The original words for ſtrange Gods are Ξένων δαιμονίων; Ξένων means foreign, of another country, and δαιμονίων, to the beſt of my preſent recollection, is, in every other paſſage of Scripture, tranſlated *devils*. If it had been ſo tranſlated here, then we ſhould have read, that Paul was a ſetter-forth of foreign *devils*: But you could have made nothing at all of this; it would have ſounded a note quite in diſcord with your tune. The word, however, in the ſyſtem of Pagan theology, means Deities of an inferior and miniſterial caſt; ſometimes the ſpirits of dead men deified; ſometimes even more imaginary beings, who had never had any real exiſtence *. Of the one ſort, or the other of theſe, they had a ſurpriſing multiplicity, for almoſt all the occaſions and incidents of life; and whom they worſhipped, as the Papiſts at this day their tutelary Saints, with exceſſive ſuperſtition. This is what St. Paul reproves in them afterwards, when he tells them, that they were in all things ὡς δεισιδαιμονεστέρους, too much addicted to—What? not ſurely the worſhip of the one

* See Joſeph Mede's Treatiſe on the Apoſtacy of the latter times, chap. iv. page 629. edit. 3.

true

true God, but to that of imaginary inferior Divinities. This meaning of the word, therefore, may afford ſome probability that St. Paul had preached Jeſus Chriſt as the mediator, as the Father's miniſter, or meſſenger; but if he meant to exhibit him as the one true and ſupreme God, he had acquitted himſelf very ill, and ſpeaking too by inſpiration, if he raiſed the conceptions of his audience no higher than to their own petty and menial Divinities.

But farther; The ſacred Hiſtorian, giving the reaſon why St. Paul was queſtioned as a ſetter-forth of foreign (Gods) Dæmons, ſays, *becauſe he preached* τον Ἰησοῦν καὶ τὴν Ἀνάστασιν, *Jeſus and the Reſurrection.* The latter you have had the addreſs to keep out of your reader's view; though, the expreſſion *foreign Dæmons* being plural, a doubt may ariſe, whether it be not meant of both. It is poſſible that the Athenians, habituated to dæmonize almoſt every idea of the human mind, might miſtake the latter word, as they certainly did the former, for the name of a Dæmon; and in that caſe Paul was queſtioned, as the great and wiſe Socrates had before been put to death, as a ſetter-forth of ſtrange, or foreign Dæmons, Dæmons really plural, namely Jeſus and Ἀνάστασις, the Reſurrection. I will not inſiſt, that this is certainly St. Luke's meaning; but his words being fairly capable

capable of this interpretation, you ought to have proved, that it certainly was not, before you had argued ſo peremptorily from one half of the reaſon recorded, to the utter excluſion of the other. Otherwiſe a ſturdy diſputant, diſpoſed to defend every inch of ground, might fight you with your own weapons, and making a proper uſe of what you have been pleaſed to leave of the text, arrive, by the very ſame ſteps, at a very different concluſion. Thus; "becauſe Paul preached Ἀνάστασις, "to the Athenians, they ſaid he ſeemed to be a "ſetter-forth of ſtrange Gods. Here, upon a call "to explain himſelf, and anſwer the charge of "ſetting-forth ſtrange Gods, in having preached "Ἀνάστασις, he avows, that the Divinity, whom "he had preached, was that God, whom they knew "not (the unknown God) but worſhipped igno-"rantly: but he had preached Ἀνάστασις, there-"fore Ἀνάστασις, *i. e.* the Reſurrection, was that "God hitherto unknown to them, and one with "the Father.".

Such an adverſary might have quoted great authorities both ancient and modern for this interpretation of Ἀναστάσις*; and to ſay the truth, it ſeems to be a very dubious point, whether St.

* Conjectures on the New Teſtament, printed for W. Bowyer and J. Nichols. Page 163.

Luke

Luke did not really mean ſo. Certainly to mangle Scripture at this ſtrange rate is not fair treatment of your readers; of whom perhaps not one in forty would conſult his Bible.

But to proceed; When Paul afterwards, ſtanding in the midſt of Mars' Hill explains his own doctrine, and mentions his accidental diſcovery of an Altar inſcribed *to the unknown God*, does he tell his audience, does he give them the ſmalleſt intimation, that Jeſus was that *unknown God*, whom they ignorantly worſhipped? Quite the contrary. After a ſpirited and ſublime deſcription of ſeveral of his attributes and actions, he comes at length to inform them, that, though *he had winked at their former ignorance; yet he now commandeth all men every where to repent; becauſe he* (the unknown God) *hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteouſneſs, by that Man* (Jeſus Chriſt) *whom he* (the unknown God) *hath ordained; whereof he hath given aſſurance unto all men; in that he* (the unknown God) *hath raiſed him* (Jeſus Chriſt) *from the dead.* Is it poſſible to mark their different attributes and characters more ſtrongly?

Surely (I had like to have ſaid ſuch ſhameleſs ſophiſtry) ſuch a mortifying proof of the power of bigotry and prejudice never before fell from the pen of man. Such alacrity in the cauſe certainly

entitles you to ſome mark of pre-eminence. Another genius, famous in his way, hath pre-engaged the motto of Sum Solus; yet *ſume decus meritis quæſitum*, and let yours be *quando invenies parem*.

But you go on to prove that the God whom Paul preached at Athens, and Jeſus Chriſt have the ſame attributes.

" Of God whom he preached at Athens, even Jeſus, he ſays.	" Of Jeſus Chriſt, expreſly ſo named, he ſays.
" God that made the world, and all things therein, ſeeing he is the Lord of heaven and earth, ver. 24. for in him we live, and move, and have our being, ver. 28."	" By him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, viſible and inviſible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him, and for him. And he is before all things, and by him all things conſiſt. Col. i. 16, 17."

That

That Jeſus was not the *unknown God*, whom Paul preached at Athens, has been juſt demonſtrated. That he is not the Supreme God, your readers would have known by intuition, if you had been pleaſed to cloſe the magnificent amplification, in which St. Paul has here diſplayed his wonderful dignity, with the Apoſtle's own words. *For it pleaſed the Father that in him ſhould all fullneſs dwell.* All this fullneſs therefore, all theſe powers, and attributes depended on the Father's pleaſure; but the fullneſs, powers, and attributes of the Supreme God are neceſſarily in him, and can depend on nothing. Jeſus therefore, whoſe fullneſs, powers, and attributes are dependent, is not the Supreme God.

You may reply that the words, *The Father*, are not in the original, but have been inſerted by the tranſlators. This is very true, but will not help you out. The original words are, ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησε πᾶν το πληρωμα κατοικῆσαι; literally, *It was the good pleaſure of —— that in him ſhould all fullneſs dwell.* The good pleaſure of whom? either of the Son, whoſe attributes are here enumerated; or of the Father, with the mention of whom the amplification was introduced. Suppoſe, therefore, of the Son; then his powers and attributes depended on his own pleaſure, and he could aſſume, or lay them down at his own option. Then he could not be

the neceſſarily and ſelf-exiſtent God; for his attributes and perfections are as neceſſary, as his exiſtence; not to mention that it is not over good ſenſe to ſay, that any perſon's fullneſs, or perfection, depends on his own will. Go back again therefore to the introductory word, Father, and the former conſequence will return, that Jeſus is not Supreme God; becauſe his fullneſs is dependent on the Father's pleaſure. Upon the whole, our tranſlators have judiciouſly inſerted the word *Father*; and, I believe, you will have no objection, when you ſee, that the change of it into *Son* will avail you nothing.

Page 102. "Whoſe are the Father's, and of "whom, as concerning the fleſh, Chriſt came, "who is over all, God bleſſed for ever. Amen. "Romans ix. 5."

It is not denied, that Jeſus Chriſt is ſometimes ſtiled God in the Holy Scriptures, in a ſecondary, or ſubordinate ſenſe; and not Jeſus Chriſt only, but the Angel who ſpake to Moſes in the buſh *; and Moſes himſelf was inſtead of a God to his brother Aaron †, and was made a God to Pharaoh ‡; Princes are called Gods: *And he*

* Exod. iii. 3, 4 Acts vii. 30. † Exod. vi. 16.
‡ Exod. vii. 1.

called

called them Gods to whom the word of God came *. It will not therefore follow, that by God, in this paſſage, muſt be underſtood, the one true and ſelf-exiſtent God; eſpecially as the very ſame Apoſtle has aſſured us, in words the moſt expreſs and definite that language can ſupply, that though *there be Gods many, and Lords many, yet to us there is but one God*, one true and ſelf-exiſtent God, *the Father;* and that in oppoſition to Jeſus Chriſt, who is the *one Lord.*

This I ſay on the ſuppoſition that the word Θεος, God, is ſpoken of the perſon of Chriſt. But you, Sir, who undertake to be an expounder of God's word, ought to have known, that expoſitors of great name, and among the reſt Mr. Locke, have proceeded on the contrary ſuppoſition. They knew this was the ſingle text, that, at firſt view, ſeemed to aſcribe Supreme Godhead to the Son, and they ſaw the neceſſity of interpreting in ſuch a ſenſe as might not run counter to the whole currency of Scripture.

In this they acted like wiſe and cautious men, with becoming reverence towards the word of truth, which muſt always ſpeak the ſame thing. But you, Sir, had none of their ſcruples; the

* John x. 35.

found

ſound of the words was on your ſide, and the majority of your readers would be determined by ſound alone, and had never heard of Mr. Locke or his expoſition. It would have been but fair, however, to have informed them that he interpreted the paſſage thus; *Of whom as concerning the fleſh Chriſt came, who is over all*, viz. by the Father's appointment, *God be bleſſed for ever. Amen.* If this tranſlation can be juſtified, it brings deſtruction on your inference; and you ought to have given your reaſons why it could not, and not to have quoted the common tranſlation, as conveying the indiſputable meaning of the text.

Though I differ from ſo great and good a man with infinite diffidence, I own I am not ſatisfied with this interpretation; and my reaſon is, becauſe I think the Greek word ἐυλογητος ſignifies not (benedictus) bleſſed, but (benedicendus) worthy to be bleſſed, and that, *God be worthy to be bleſſed*, is not either good ſenſe, or good Engliſh. I am not, however, peremptory in this, and may be miſtaken. In another opinion, I think, I am not miſtaken, that a plain, rational, and Unitarian ſenſe may be put upon the paſſage, without ſupplying one word, or altering the common pointing.

The original words are theſe, ὁ ὢν ἐπι παντων Θεος ἐυλογητος ἐις τὺς αἰωνας. Let us take St. Paul

Paul therefore for his own interpreter. In the xvth chapter of his firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians, quoted before on another occaſion, we read theſe words; Then cometh the end, the συντελεια τῦ αἰῶνος, as St. Matthew calls it *, *when he ſhall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he ſhall have put down all rule, and authority and power: For he muſt reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. And when all things ſhall be ſubdued unto him, then ſhall the Son alſo himſelf be ſubject unto him, that put all things under him; that God may be all in all.* This delegated kingdom therefore was to laſt till the συντελεια τῦ αἰῶνος, and agreeably hereto it is ſaid, that *God appointed him heir of all things, and by him* ἐποιησε τῦς αἰῶνας, (made) *diſpoſed the ages* †, the different periods of the world, with reſpect to God's moral government, of which the Chriſtian is to be the laſt.

Here we have Jeſus Chriſt exhibited as holding the kingdom in quality of the Father's Vicegerent; and this Vicegerency is to continue till the *end*, the conſummation of the *age*, the laſt or Chriſtian period, and conſequently of all the periods, all which he ordered or diſpoſed, when it is to be reſigned to God who gave it. We know likewiſe from a variety of paſſages in the Sacred Writings, that he

† Mat. xxiv. 3. † Heb. i. 2.

who

who acted or ſpoke in the name, and with the authority of God, is ſtiled God in an inferior and qualified ſenſe; much more, therefore, may Jeſus Chriſt, who is tranſcendently the greateſt of God's miniſters. It may therefore be true of Jeſus Chriſt, *that he is over all God to be bleſſed* εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, *ſo long as the ages ſhall continue*, and yet that he is not the one true and ſelf-exiſtent God.

Whether this interpretation, or Mr. Locke's, give the truer meaning of the original, is not of much importance in the queſtion. If either of them, or any other that aſcribes not ſupreme Godhead to the Son, reſult grammatically from the words, and exhibit a ſenſe conſiſtent with the whole ſtrain of Scripture, they all equally deſtroy your argument, which depends on the ſuppoſed certainty, that the words are incapable of being otherwiſe underſtood.

Thus far I have ſuppoſed the preſent to be the true reading of the text, but you muſt now be told that a ſuſpicion has ariſen, that a ſmall tranſpoſition has happened, that gives it a very different complexion from that which it originally bore. This ſuſpicion too is not taken up merely to ſolve a difficulty; but there are reaſons that ſupport it with a great degree of probability.

First; this is the only paſſage of the whole Scriptures, where this, or a ſimilar, title is given to the Son; and ſingularity is, of itſelf, a reaſonable ground of ſuſpicion.

Secondly; inſtead of, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων, &c. it is ſuſpected that the true original reading was, ὢν ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων. For it is well known, that the ancient manuſcripts are written without any of the marks of breathing now in uſe. Now it was viſibly the eaſieſt thing in the world, for a careleſs or knaviſh tranſcriber, to change it into the preſent reading, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων. And there was an age, or rather ſucceſſive ages, when the advantage would be ſeized with greedineſs, by a particular party of men, who had long the power in their hands, and defended by all the arts of fraud, and all the terrors of force. Thus the error might become general, and in time the only reading of the manuſcripts. Errors leſs eaſy to be accounted for have happened; and it is now no ſecret, that one whole verſe * has been foiſted into the Sacred Writings, and ſtill deforms and pollutes them in ſpite of demonſtrative evidence, to ſerve the very purpoſe, for which this text is ſo confidently quoted.

* 1 John v. 7.

Thirdly; the very peculiar phraſeology is another ſtrong preſumption againſt the preſent reading. It is, I am perſuaded, univerſal with Prophane Authors to omit the participle; and with the Sacred Writers and St. Paul himſelf ſo very general to omit it, in ſimilar expreſſions, that, ſuppoſing him to have meant as you ſuppoſe, if the chance had been calculated before he wrote, whether he would have written, ο ων επι παντων, or only ο επι παντων, it would have been a thouſand to one for the latter againſt the former. From what I have juſt ſaid of the Sacred Writers, I except St. John, who was more ſtudious of ſimplicity, than of propriety or elegance of expreſſion. Any perſon who will take the trouble to conſult his Greek Teſtament, may eaſily be convinced of the truth of the foregoing obſervation. To give a few inſtances. Matt. vi. 1. τῳ πατρὶ ὑμῶν τῳ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς; — vi. 9. Πατὲρ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοις ουρανοις. And St. Paul in the very words preceding the text in queſtion, το κατα σαρκα; and again, in the verſe immediately following, οὐ γαρ παντες οἱ ἐξ Ισραηλ; Eph. iv. 6. εἱς Θεος καὶ πατηρ παντων, ὁ ἐπι παντων. Why not ὁ ὢν in this place? If ων had no buſineſs in this, what had it to do in the other; What ſhould induce him in this particular paſſage to vary from his uſual phraſeology, and adopt a manner of expreſſion of neither equal elegance, nor equal emphaſis? For the participle ων being utterly

unneceſſary

unneceſſary, is an uſeleſs load upon the ſenſe, particularly in the laſt ſtep of a gradation, where energy is moſt required, and could have been underſtood here, with more propriety, than in any of the places juſt quoted. Certainly ſo mere an expletive would not have been uſed by "a preacher who "gave words only to his ideas, and never ſought "an expletive to grace, much leſs diſgrace his "language, and diſtract his argument *."

Fourthly; It will not tend to leſſen the ſuſpicion, if we compare the different effects the different readings will have upon the context. St. Paul was a writer of a warm, though regulated imagination, and great addreſs. He is here enumerating the great privileges which the Jews had above the Gentile world. This he does by a noble figure, very uſual with him, and by Rhetoricians called amplification; and it was not his manner, on ſuch occaſions, to leave any thing ſhort; which, in the preſent caſe, according to the common reading, he evidently does. For he mentions not the circumſtance, that of all others moſt honourably diſtinguiſhed the Jews, and ſtops in the perſon of Chriſt; which is not the higheſt ſtep, to which the gradation may aſcend. If we admit the conjectural tranſpoſition, this great circumſtance is added, and

* Layman, page 131.

the amplification riſes to the very higheſt pitch, from the Son to the Father; from the ſecond perſon in univerſal nature, to the one true, and ſelf-exiſtent God, above whom there neither is, nor can be any thing. *I could wiſh myſelf accurſed from Chriſt, for my brethren, my kinſmen according to the fleſh, who are Iſraelites; whoſe are the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the laws, and the ceremonial of worſhip, and the promiſes; whoſe are the fathers, and from whom Chriſt had his earthly generation; whoſe is the God, that ruleth over all, worthy to be bleſſed for ever. Amen.* A concluſion ſtrong and ſublime, and full of reverence towards him, who is the *bleſſed and only Potentate, the one God and Father of all, who is over all* *.

I will not ſay that this is certainly the true reading; I confeſs I think it probable. If St. Paul had been a Prophane Author, I ſhould have admitted the correction without ſcruple; more reverence is due to the word of God. It may not, however, be improper for the learned world to give it a mature conſideration. If I have been tedious on this text, I hope to be forgiven. It is the only text of the whole Bible, that ſeems to ſay any thing for Athanaſianiſm; and therefore merited a full diſcuſſion.

* Eph. iv. 6.

Page 130. " Now our Lord Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, and God, even our Father——comfort your hearts, and eſtabliſh you in every good word and work. 2 Theſſ. ii. 16. Either there are *two* nominatives joined by the copulative *and*, or there is but *one* in the ſentence before us; and in that caſe the copulative unites two ſpecific terms put in appoſition to the one general nominative; if the former were the caſe the verb muſt *neceſſarily* have been put in the plural number, whereas from its ſtanding in the ſingular, we muſt conceive it governed by one nominative only; now, if there be found one term in the ſentence including the reſt within its general import, that is the nominative governing the verb; but I have all along aſſerted, that the Father is God, and that the Son is God, and therefore now ſay, that the word *God* is here that general term comprehending within itſelf, our Lord Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, and *even our Father*, one God, which *hath* loved us, and *hath* given us everlaſting conſolation."

I had diſcovered before, that you had extraordinary ſkill in grammar, but did not ſuſpect your abilities to be of ſo prodigious a ſize. You have feſcued the Engliſh word *hath*, as if it were the ſingular verb agreeing with ſo many nominatives comprized one within another; but the truth is, that

that in the original it is no verb, but a participle agreeing, as it ought, with the name of the ſingle perſon, of whom it ſpeaks; ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατηρ ἡμων ὁ ἀγαπησας ημας.

Again; your rule is not true, that ſeveral nominatives ſingular joined by the copulative *and*, *neceſſarily* require a verb plural. They may have a common verb of the ſingular number, how many of them ſoever they may be; and whatever difference of perſon, of ſubſtance, of ſituation, of qualities they may expreſs, and whether one comprehend any other of them or not. You will not perhaps take my word; but here is the evidence of three unexceptionable witneſſes.

——— "Non
"Te, Torquate, genus, non te facundia, non te
"Reſtituet pietas."
Hor. Ode 7. Lib. 4.

"Ipſa Pales agros, atque ipſe reliquit Apollo."
Virg. Ecl. Daphnis.

"Et pater Æneas, et avunculus excitet Hector."
Virg. Æneid. 5.

Laſtly, That blind bard, who blind as he was, could ſee as far as ſome people who have an eye

or

or two to ſpare, has put no leſs than four nominatives, of which no one comprehends another, before one common verb of the ſingular number.

" Ὅσσον ἐφ' Ὑρμίνῃ, ϗ Μύρσινος, ἐσχατόωσα,
" Πέτρῃ τ' Ὠλενίῃ, ϗ Ἀλείσιον ἐντὸς ἐέργει."
Hom. Il. lib. 2. l. 615. 616.

If theſe four examples do not ſatisfy you, you might, in a little time, be helped to forty thouſand from writers in all languages, of poetry and proſe; and thus your fine-ſpun theory about ſpecific terms, and nominatives and verbs, turns out to be no better than arrant nonſenſe. For, though Jeſus Chriſt and God our Father, had been not only different perſons, but different Gods, St. Paul might, with the greateſt reverence for grammar rules, have uſed the verb παρακαλεσαι in the ſingular number. In fact, you betray a manifeſt hankering after Sabellianiſm; nay, rather effectually " confound the perſons," when you ſay, that " God is that general term comprehending " within itſelf *our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and even our* " *Father*, one God." For if the perſons are different, as (ex hypotheſi) they ought to be, here is an inſtance from the Apoſtle himſelf, that ruins your whole proceſs; which ſuppoſes that the common verb ought to be of the plural number, when it is referred to two different nominatives of the ſingular;

lar; and if Jeſus Chriſt be one perſon, and God our Father another perſon, which you dare not deny, here is the very neceſſity you have been contending for, two perſons of the ſingular number, of which the one does not comprehend the other.

Page 133. "God was manifeſt in the fleſh. "1 Tim. iii. 16."

If by God here you do not mean the Supreme God, this text is nothing to your purpoſe. For we have ſeen that the word, Θεος, God, is often taken in an inferior ſenſe. If you mean the Supreme God, what ſenſe do you give to *was manifeſt* in the fleſh? If you mean *became viſible*, and *was ſeen of men*, how do you reconcile this with the text that declareth, *No man hath ſeen God at any time?* But farther, common Chriſtians ſhould not be uninformed, that it is far enough from being certain that (Θεὸς) Gods is the true reading. Some good manuſcripts, and the moſt ancient verſions, made neareſt to the times of the Apoſtles, and to their own country, read very differently, viz. ὁ *That which*, or ος *He that* *; and Sir Iſaac Newton, in his ſecond letter to Le Clerc, has come little ſhort of a demonſtration, that this word is as ſhameleſs a forgery, as the ſpurious verſe of

* Wetſtein. ad Locum, et Prologomena.

John

John mentioned above. Men, who know not theſe things, ſhould not ſet up for expounders of the Scriptures, leſt peradventure they ſhould teach another Goſpel; and, thoſe who do, ought to give their reaſons why they conſider diſputed texts as authentic, that unprejudiced inquirers may judge for themſelves: Otherwiſe true Chriſtianity may be argued out of the world.

But I go back to page 128; where I had overlooked ſomething, which I by no means intended to paſs by. "The following is an explicit declaration that Chriſt is both God (you muſt mean Supreme God) and man: For in him dwelleth all the fullneſs of the Godhead bodily. Coloſſ. ii. 9."

It may be a ſufficient anſwer to refer you to the firſt chapter of this very epiſtle, above quoted; where the ſame Apoſtle having given a moſt magnificent deſcription of the God-like actions, powers, and dignity of the Son, in a long and well-ſupported amplification, accounts for them all by this remarkable expreſſion; *For it pleaſed the Father that in him ſhould all fullneſs dwell.* To this I cannot ſee what reaſonable reply can be made, but will not depend upon it alone. I will venture to affirm that our tranſlation very faintly, if at all, exhibits the ideas of the original; that the text is ſo far

from containing an "explicit," that it contains no declaration at all, that Jesus Christ is either Supreme "God," or "man."

The Greek words are ὅτι ἐν αὐτῳ κατοικει παν το πληρωμα τῆς θεοτητος σωματικως; and in order to clear up the true sense, it will be necessary,

First, To state the precise meaning of πληρωμα:

Secondly, The relation which Θεοτητος bears to it, and the meaning of this latter word:

Thirdly, The exact idea conveyed by the adverb σωματικως.

First, therefore; πληρωμα is a derivative from the verb πληροω, which signifies to fill up, or to compleat; it is formed from the preterperfect tense passive, and consequently has a passive signification, and means not fullness in the abstract, an inherent and underived fullness; but *that which is added, or put to, by way of making a thing compleat.* This precise signification it has, Matt. ix. 16. where we read, *For that which is put in to fill it up* (το πληρωμα αὐτῦ) *taketh from the garment, and the rent is made worse.*

Secondly,

Secondly; The relations of της Θεοτητος to πληρωμα can be no more than three. It muſt ſignify either, as Grammarians ſpeak, the material cauſe, that of which the thing added conſiſted; or the receiver of the added powers, or the giver of them; that is, either the thing filled up, as ἀυτῳ in St. Matthew, or that which filled it up. The firſt is impoſſible; becauſe the firſt ſelf-exiſtent cauſe could never communicate all, or any of his own nature, that, by which himſelf is God, and which is neceſſarily in him, to any perſon whatſoever; and we have proved that πληρωμα means ſomething ſo communicated. The ſecond relation is equally impoſſible; becauſe the Godhead is an idea comprehending all perfection and plenitude, to which nothing can be added, and from which nothing can be taken. It remains therefore, that it muſt ſtand in the laſt of the three relations, and ſignify the giver of the powers received. It may be objected that Godhead is a mere abſtract idea, and cannot be an agent. But an agent it is, and can be nothing but an agent in this paſſage; and therefore Θεοτης, Godhead, muſt, by a very common figure, be put for Θεὸς, God. In this very meaning το Θειον a term exactly ſynonymous with ἡ Θεοτης is uſed by St. Paul himſelf. Acts xvii. 29. *Foraſmuch then as we are the offſpring of God we ought not to think, that the Godhead*, that is,

God, *is like unto gold or ſilver*, &c. Godhead literally taken, is nothing real, but an abſtract idea exiſting ſolely in the mind, and conſequently could never be conceived like to any ſubſtance in the univerſe, material, or immaterial.

Thirdly; σωματικως cannot ſignify *in his body* conſiſtently with your ſenſe of the text. For *the fullneſs of the Godhead*, the plenitude of him, *whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain*, whoſe *throne is heaven*, and *whoſe footſtool earth*; could never be cooped in the narrow compaſs of a human body. And if σωματικῶς be underſtood to mean, in his body, it is a mere redundant word, that expreſſes no more than had before been expreſſed by ἐν αὐτῷ, in him; except it be contended (which is not poſſible to be conceived) that the plenitude of Godhead reſided not in his mental powers, but in his human fleſh. We may fix its meaning, I think, from another paſſage of the ſame Apoſtle, where he ſays, who ſhall deliver me, *from the body* of this death, ἐκ τοῦ σωματος τοῦ Θανατοῦ τουτου *? Whoever heard of death's having a real body? The body of this death moſt probably means, the ſo many concurring cauſes of death, this army, as it were, of deſtroyers; and then

* Rom. vii. 24.

σωματικῶς

σωματικῶς in the preſent text will mean, *Collectively, in one aggregate ſum.*

Now we may venture to tranſlate, and the true meaning will come out thus; *For in him dwell, in one great aggregate, all thoſe glorious gifts and powerful communications of God, which might compleat him*, viz. for the high office and dignity for which he was appointed.

I have the cleareſt conviction that, though it be impoſſible to render the Greek words literally, on account of the very different genius of the languages, I have given the Apoſtle's meaning very exactly. And if this conviction could be increaſed, it would be increaſed by comparing this with the following text of the ſame St. Paul; *That ye might be filled with all the fullneſs of God* *, ινα πληρωθητε εἰς παν πληρωμα τῦ Θεῦ. It has been proved, by Acts xvii. 29. that in Paul's Language ἡ Θεοτης and ὁ Θεος are exactly equivalent terms; he therefore might have wrote in this laſt text, πληρωμα τῆς Θεοτητος inſtead of πληρωμα τῦ Θεῦ; and if he had ſo wrote, the ideas conveyed would have been the ſame, as are conveyed by πληρωμα τῦ Θεῦ. In the latter text τῦ Θεῦ can have no other relation, to ſpeak again in the language of Gramma-

* Eph. iii. 19.

rians,

rians, but of the agent to the action; and the purport of the Apoſtle's prayer, will be this, *That you may effectually be filled with every gift and grace of God, neceſſary to compleat you*, viz. for your Chriſtian warfare, for working out your ſalvation, and the attainment of everlaſting life.

Page 154. " Take heed therefore unto your-
" ſelves, and to all the flock, over the which the
" Holy Ghoſt has made you overſeers, to feed the
" church of God, which he hath purchaſed with
" his blood. Acts xx. 28. What can convince,
" if this be unable? Shall we ſee the blood of God
" himſelf ſtreaming for our redemption, and ſtill
" deny that God and man are one Chriſt?"

Pray, Sir, who denied this ſo poſitively as yourſelf? Did you not inſiſt, in one of your preliminary chapters, that Chriſt was to be divided? And was not I obliged to appeal to your own ſo much admired creed, to convince you, that the perſon of Chriſt is one and not two? And now, who but you for an aſſerter of the unity of Chriſt's perſon? It was then your cue to talk of one Chriſt, who was God, and another who was man; to affirm that the one Chriſt knew what the other knew not, and could do what the other was unable. But now, it ſeems different meaſures are neceſſary, and we have you, as I foretold we ſhould, in your Atha-

Athanaſian regimentals, as ſpruce and trim, as if your frock had never been ſoiled, and you had never bluſhed to wear it. Now the perſon of Chriſt is ſo inſeparably one, that what he could ſuffer only as man, one of the greateſt infirmities of human nature, is attributed to his "greater na- "ture;" and we are called upon to "ſee the "blood of God himſelf ſtreaming for our redemp- "tion. A while ago, as man, he was ignorant, "but now he can bleed as God." Some of your brethren, however, are provided with a Chriſt, that can, and another that cannot bleed; and it is a pity you had not equal foreſight; for depend upon it you will make but an aukward figure with your "bleeding God."

The blood of the Supreme God you muſt mean. Shall Jeſus Chriſt decide the matter for you? He tells you, *that God is a Spirit* *, *and that a Spirit hath not fleſh* (and conſequently no "blood") nor bones †. If you will not take the word of Jeſus Chriſt, dare you really give the lie to your beloved articles; the firſt of which poſitively aſſerts, that "the one living and true God is without body, "parts, or paſſions," and conſequently bloodleſs? He therefore, from whom "blood" ſo copiouſly "ſtreamed," could not be "the one living and

* John iv. 24. † Ibid. xxiv. 39.

"true

" true God:" Or, if he was, will you ſtill fight ſo like a Quixote, for ſo falſe a Dulcinea, as you muſt now own theſe ſame articles to be?

After all, you muſt agree that the *blood of God* is a very ſingular expreſſion, and not very reconcileable with either Scripture or reaſon, and might have known, that there are manuſcripts of good authority, and verſions of the higheſt antiquity *, that read the *Church of the Lord, or the Church of Chriſt;* one of which, one may, I think, conclude with certainty is the true reading. But no matter; it ſounded cleverly on your ſide; and ſound is ſomething where nothing more ſubſtantial can be had.

Page 181. " Grace be unto you, and peace " from him which was, and which is, and which " is to come, and from the ſeven ſpirits, which " are before his throne, and from Jeſus Chriſt. " Rev. i. 4, 5."

In your comment on this text, you *aſſure* us that theſe ſeven ſpirits are alſo God; and this you prove in a moſt extraordinary manner; thus; " the " ſeven ſpirits (you muſt mean metaphorically un- " derſtood) are the eyes of the Lamb; and to find

* Wetſtein ad Locum.

" favour

" favour in God's eyes, is to find favour with " God: Therefore the eyes of the Lamb are the " Lamb himſelf," that is, the ſeven ſpirits are the Lamb: This it is to be maſter of one's craft; a bungler might have puzzled for a month, and at laſt have owned the neceſſity of yielding poor Lindſey this point at leaſt. But, with your Bible in your hand, you can work wonders; take it up therefore again, and read Rev. v. 6. you will there find (if words are capable of meaning) that the ſeven ſpirits are not put figuratively for the ſeven eyes of the Lamb, but the *ſeven eyes for the ſeven ſpirits of God, ſent forth into all the earth.* The ſeven ſpirits therefore are the Lamb's miniſters; and they are called his eyes by the plaineſt metaphor in the world, in perfect conformity to the cuſtom of the Aſiatic nations, who called the King's miniſters the King's eyes, but ſurely never miſtook them for the King himſelf.

It turns out therefore, that " ſpirits" are not put for " eyes," but " eyes" for " ſpirits," and thus all your fine reaſoning is vaniſhed into ſmoke. But I will not yet cry ſhame; you ſhall have your own way, and the Lamb's eyes ſhall be the Lamb himſelf, provided you grant the Lamb to be Jeſus Chriſt. What then will you make of the ſacred text? Why, you introduce the good old Apoſtle,

in the plenitude of his inſpiration, delivering this bleſſing to the churches of Aſia; "Grace be unto "you, and peace, from him which was, and "which is, and which is to come, and from Jeſus "Chriſt, who is before his throne, and from Jeſus "Chriſt." Now I will cry ſhame; and I really think you will have the conſcience to take ſome little, at leaſt, to yourſelf.

There are two paſſages of your book, in which you ſeem to triumph much; and which, for that reaſon, I have reſerved to be conſidered here. The former is at page 166. "But the word of God "(here ſeated on a horſe, and declared to be Jeſus "Chriſt himſelf under that appellation) is expreſly "ſaid to be God." You allude to John i. 1. "Jeſus Chriſt therefore being that word manifeſt "in the fleſh, and that word being God, Jeſus "Chriſt is therefore one with the Father God."

You muſt mean, as I have obſerved before, that the Father is Supreme God, and the Son Supreme God; otherwiſe you are not patching up the breaches of the eſtabliſhment, but utterly overthrowing it, under the maſk of mighty zeal for its defence. Not to ſtand with you for little points, it ſhall be granted, that by Λογὸς, the word, is meant Jeſus Chriſt. What then? Why then Jeſus

Chriſt,

Chriſt, or the Son, is Supreme God. Pray, Sir, not faſter than good ſpeed. The text runs thus; *In the beginning was the word*, (Jeſus Chriſt) *and the word was with God, and the word was God.* But God in both clauſes means Supreme God; now there are either two Supreme Gods, or but one Supreme God. You will not ſay there are two; therefore God in both clauſes muſt mean one and the ſame Supreme God. The Apoſtle's narrative therefore will ſtand thus; *Jeſus Chriſt was in the beginning, and Jeſus Chriſt was with the Supreme God, and Jeſus Chriſt was the Supreme God, with whom himſelf was;* that is, Jeſus Chriſt was the Supreme God, aſſociated with, and accompanied by himſelf: But one would hope you would be cautious of ſaying this for the ſake of common ſenſe.

Again; you will not deny the *Father* to be Supreme God: Subſtitute therefore *the Son* inſtead of *the word*, and the text will read thus; *the Son was with the Supreme God*, that is, with the Father, *and the Son was Supreme God.* There is, however, but one Supreme God; therefore the *Son* was the *Father.* I would not adviſe you to hold this ſort of language publicly, for fear of a diſaſter from malapert children in the ſtreets, who, as Horace informs you *, are ſometimes not over civil to maintainers

* ——————Vellunt tibi barbam
Laſcivi pueri;—————— Sat. III Lib. I.

of paradoxes. One would not think a prudent man would be greatly eager to introduce ſuch confuſion into every department of human ſpeculation, to countenance the laying of ſuch a foundation for univerſal ſcepticiſm, and the making a perfect chaos of the human mind. Thus ſhocking are the effects of prejudice, and above all of religious prejudice. It is, however, peculiarly unkind to preſs the words of this venerable Apoſtle into this cruel ſervice; for he has been particularly careful, through all his writings, in language the moſt plain, the moſt ſimple, and the moſt deciſive, to aver the Son's inferiority to the Father: If therefore this text does really contain ſo ſtrange a propoſition, he ſeems to have wrote his whole Goſpel with the expreſs purpoſe of confuting it; and the moſt that can be proved by it, if no conſiſtent meaning can be found, will be that we do not underſtand it.

There is, however, no neceſſity of recurring to this ſuppoſition. Various interpretations have been given by different Unitarians; of all of which you ought to have proved the impoſſibility or improbability, before you had argued from a ſenſe, which, after all, may not be the ſenſe of the Apoſtle. This you have not done, and therefore plainly begged the queſtion; a ſort of proof, that

of

of all others does the leaſt honour to a logician; becauſe it abſolutely proves nothing, and amounts to neither more, nor leſs, than ſaying it is ſo, becauſe it is ſo.

Without meaning to diſparage other interpretations, ſome of which, I am ſure, may be grammatically defended, I intreat you to attend to the following obſervations. We read, Exod. xxiv. 9, 10, *Then went up Moſes and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and ſeventy of the Elders of Iſrael; and they ſaw the God of Iſrael.* This God of Iſrael could not be the Supreme God, becauſe we are aſſured by St. John, by St. Paul, and by Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, who lived many ages after Moſes and Aaron, that *no man hath ſeen God at any time; ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor ſeen his ſhape* †. If it ſhould be enquired who was this viſible God of Iſrael, Moſes may be allowed to explain himſelf, who, in the preceding chapter, has recorded theſe words, *Behold I ſend an Angel before thee—My name is in him.* Though, therefore, it ſhould be granted that ὁ Λογος, the word, denotes the perſon of Chriſt, yet it will by no means follow, that θεος, God, in the third clauſe, denotes a perſon of equal power and perfections with τον θεον, God, in the ſecond clauſe.

† John i. 18.—v. 37. 1 Tim. vi. 16.

The

The original Greek term for God, in the ſecond clauſe, is dignified with a mark of pre-eminence, which is wanting in the third; where, however, the fundamental rules of the Greek language ſeem abſolutely to require it, if the contraſted terms were meant to expreſs equality of different perſons; if God, in each clauſe, were God in the ſame ſupereminent degree, with a ſameneſs or equality of attributes and perfections. It has been proved that the title of God is given to many perſons, in the Holy Scriptures, infinitely inferior to the one true God and Father of all; and it is moſt certain, that if the Apoſtle had really intended, in two words, to oppoſe ſupremacy to ſubordination, he muſt have uſed the very terms he has uſed, τὸν Θεὸν for the former, and Θεὸς ſimply for the latter.

According to the idea therefore ſuggeſted by theſe remarks, for the truth of which I appeal to all competent maſters of the Greek language, the Apoſtle's meaning will turn out to be this; *In the beginning was Jeſus Chriſt, and Jeſus Chriſt was with the Supreme God, and Jeſus Chriſt was God in a ſubordinate and limited ſenſe*, dignified with this title becauſe he was God's Vicegerent in the great work of creation, as he was afterwards in the merciful work of redemption, and ſtill is in the adminiſtration of God's providence.

The

The other text is page 149. " And we know " that the Son of God is come, and hath given us " an underſtanding, that we may know him that " is true, and we are in him that is true; even in " his Son Jeſus Chriſt. This is the true God and " everlaſting life. 1 John v. 20. It is remark- " able that this declaration is followed by a deſire " to keep from Idols, to the overthrow of whoſe " worſhip, he preaches the Godhead of Jeſus " Chriſt, the Son."

The interpolation of the Engliſh word *even*, and the ambiguous tranſlation of the Greek propoſition ἐν, have indeed thrown ſome obſcurity on the Engliſh text; but an expoſitor ſhould be aſhamed of being miſled by any tranſlation whatever, eſpecially in ſo plain a text. Thus it ought to be read verbatim; *We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an underſtanding, that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true,* ἐν τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, *by or through* (the meaning of the propoſition ἐν in a thouſand places) that is, *by the miniſtry of his Son Jeſus Chriſt. This*— What this? ſurely he that is true, *to the knowledge of whom we are brought, in whom we are,* whoſe people we are become by the miniſtry of his Son Jeſus Chriſt—*This is* the true God and everlaſting life; in exact conformity with the declaration of

Chriſt

Chriſt himſelf, recorded by the ſame Apoſtle; *This is eternal* life to know thee the *only true God*, and *Jeſus Chriſt, whom thou haſt ſent*; thee as the giver, and Chriſt as the miniſter of eternal life.

There is another text indeed quoted by you, but either not inſiſted on, or, which I think hardly poſſible, overlooked by me, and that is the baptiſmal form, Matt. xxviii. 19.

This text has been brought into this controverſy as of itſelf almoſt deciſive; I will therefore ſay one word to it. To baptize in the name of a perſon, it is ſaid, "is to aſcribe Supreme Divinity to that "perſon, as it is paying him the higheſt divine ho-"nour." Did St. Paul conſider it in this light? *I thank my God, that I baptized none of you, but Criſpus and Gaius; leſt any ſhould ſay that I baptized in my own name* *. What, ſuch an one as Paul the Aged afraid, that, if he had baptized ſome half dozen, or ten converts, he might have been miſtaken for the Supreme God? Of him that thinketh ſo, I will ſay nothing, but the wag in Theocritus would have ſaid,

"Ὦ μοι τῶ πωγωνος, ὃν ἀληθίως ἀνεφυσας."
Theo. Idyll. X. Ver. 40.

* 1 Cor. i. 14.

I have

I have yet ſaid nothing in anſwer to all your ſophiſtry and nonſenſe about the word *worſhip*. And really, Sir, what you have ſaid on that head is ſo exceedingly childiſh, that a ſerious man does not know how to give you an anſwer. Can you really be ignorant that the original word means no more than an external act of reſpect, which, under the ſanction of the cuſtom of the country, was paid by inferiors to ſuperiors, by the party obliged to his benefactor? And can it be a wonder, that numbers ſhould pay this cuſtomary reſpect to Jeſus Chriſt, to whom ſo many were, in the moſt eſſential manner obliged, and from whom ſo many expected obligations; that numbers, convinced that he was the meſſenger of God, ſhould in that character pay him a mark of reſpect, that could not decently have been with-held from the loweſt of their magiſtrates? Or does it argue any divinity in you, when your inferior, or he who has received a favour, takes off his hat and makes you an obeyſance? For, allowing for the different cuſtoms of place and time, the ceremonies are perfectly ſimilar.

I have now gone through all the texts I propoſed to conſider. You may perhaps expect that an anſwerer ſhould travel with you ſtep by ſtep, and refute in detail every thing you have advanced. For this I had neither leiſure nor inclination; and really

I am perſuaded, this is an honour you are never likely to receive. You ſeem to have precluded it effectually. You have ſo cut and ſlaſhed the Scriptures, have maſhed them, if I may borrow a word from good old Latimer, into ſuch a *mingle*-mangle; you have tacked together ſo many texts and ſcraps of texts, that ſeem to look with aſtoniſhment at each other's faces; have deduced ſuch ſtrange inferences from ſuch ſtrange premiſes, by the aid of ſo many childiſh conceits, ſo innumerable ſophiſms, ſo many violations of the rules of logic and grammar, that he muſt be a bold man indeed, who ſhall venture to diſſolve all theſe unnatural alliances, to reſtore every word to its true ſenſe and place, to detect and expoſe every thing falſe and ridiculous, to re-eſtabliſh dethroned common ſenſe, to remove the mighty mountain of deformed rubbiſh, that fell down while you were employed in the viſionary labour of erecting a fortreſs on the ſurface of a fog.

He who ſhall undertake all this, will undertake an Herculean taſk, and I heartily wiſh him the double patience of a Grizzle and a Job. It is ſufficient for me, that I have picked up the moſt valuable materials, and arranged them properly again in that edifice, for whoſe ornament and ſtrength they were originally intended, and which you had

deformed

deformed by wrenching them away. In fact, Sir, I flatter myſelf that I have fairly fetched off moſt of your capital texts; that, to vary the metaphor, I have routed your main phalanx, and I am not much concerned about your light-armed troops. It muſt happen here, as it does in more ſerious engagements, when the *flos* and *robur exercitus* no longer ſupport them, theſe can make no defence; and, as during the conflict they look both ways, are always glad to follow the victory.

You will obſerve, that I have entered no farther into the controverſy between you and the worthy and excellent Apologiſt, than the unity of the Godhead in the perſon of the Father is concerned. Whether any, or what ſort of worſhip is due to the Son, is a moſt important queſtion in Chriſtianity, which I leave to the diſcuſſion of ſome perſon who has more leiſure and better abilities to diſcuſs it; only remarking, that, if the Son is not Supreme God, it cannot be right to worſhip him with the worſhip due to the Supreme God alone. If worſhip is due to him at all, St. Paul ſeems to have drawn the line, that it ſhould ultimately be referred *to the glory of God the Father*.

If I may declare my own ſentiments, I ſo far differ from Mr. Lindſey, that I do not think it

" ſinful" to pay ſuch worſhip to the Son, as to his high office of God's Vicegerent, and thoſe god-like powers and perfections with which the Father has inveſted him, may ſeem ſuitable. This queſtion I long to ſee yet more largely diſcuſſed, and be the reſult what it will, am ſure it will promote the intereſts of religion, and tend to make the goſpel better underſtood, and give it a wider diffuſion through the world. The diſcovery of truth can never do harm to a true religion.

But the perſon for whom the honour of finally deciding this queſtion is reſerved, muſt poſſeſs other talents, and arts of controverſy, than diſtinguiſh your performance; a clear and ſteady head, courage to own the truth, wherever he finds it, great maſtery in the original languages, and a complete knowledge of the Scriptures. Above all, he muſt be free from that outrageous and fiery zeal, which flaſhes like the exploſion of a meteor, and dims the eyes of the underſtanding by its glare.

In the mean time, whatever doubts may ariſe upon this queſtion, it is, or may be, clear enough to an unprejudiced enquirer, that you have defended an indefenſible hypotheſis. If the ſuffrage of reaſon may be taken, it decides with mathematical

tical and intuitive certainty, that the Athanaſian doctrine is not true. And of this you ſeem to be conſcious yourſelf, from the abundant pains you have taken to repreſent human reaſon as a mere *ignis fatuus*, a falſe light, that will plunge its followers in a quagmire, or precipitate them from a rock. This, however, is not ſpeaking with too much reverence of the gracious God, who gave it; and appointed it the only guide of all mankind, in all the moſt momentous concerns and enquiries reſpecting the happineſs of the preſent life; and of a vaſt majority of mankind, for much the greater number of ages; nay, even of a conſiderable majority at this day, in all the more momentous enquiries reſpecting the life to come. Men might abuſe their reaſon, or miſtake its powers, and deceive themſelves; but it is a hard thing to ſay, that God laid them under a neceſſity to follow a blind guide, that could not but deceive them.

If an appeal is made from reaſon to the bar of Scripture, that pronounces with equal certainty, that there is but one Supreme God, and that the Father only is he; except the Sacred Penmen have not written in the common language of mankind, and their words ſtand not for the ſame ideas as in the common intercourſe of men. If they do not, enquiry is at an end, and we can never be certain,

in

in any one ſentence, that there is any meaning at all.

If the Scriptures therefore ſpeak ſo poſitively, nay, even though their language were not quite ſo peremptory, it ſeems to be high time to take ſome meaſures towards abrogating that uſurped authority, that has ſo long dictated in matters of faith, that forbids Chriſt to be the only King in his own kingdom; that tempts by rewards, and deters by penalties, his ſubjects from their allegiance; that tells them, virtually at leaſt, that, if he has not, he ought to have ordained ſo or ſo; that fallible men can ſet forth the mind and will of God in words more proper and expreſſive, than it has been ſet forth by the infallible Spirit; an authority, that with equal right may be claimed by all governments, and would conſequently carry us back to Popery, and from Popery to Paganiſm.

While the preſent doctrine that three Supreme Gods are but one Supreme God, makes a part of our Church eſtabliſhment, I cannot ſee, I confeſs, how tranſubſtantiation can be confuted. What is there in that hypotheſis more ſhocking to reaſon and common ſenſe? Is it not as intuitively decided by reaſon, that three are not one, as that a ſpiritual is not a *Breaden* God? The ſacrifice of reaſon is equal in both caſes; and if it is once acknowledged

ledged that reaſon is no judge, where it has the cleareſt perceptions, the light of it is utterly extinguiſhed. The Emiſſaries of Rome are not ignorant of the advantages afforded them by this Proteſtant conſtitution, nor backward to improve them. With this weapon in their hands that dextrous Militia make the moſt ſucceſsful inroads into the territories of the Reformation. You object, ſays the crafty Prieſt, that tranſubſtantiation cannot be true, on the aſſurance of your ſenſes and your reaſon; but theſe you have already given up, when you admitted the doctrine of the Trinity on the authority of revelation, interpreted by your own Church. I aſk no more; I require no greater ſacrifice. The authority of my Church is as good as that of your's, and, if numbers and antiquity add weight, much greater. As for revelation, it is no where ſaid in all the Scriptures, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt are one God; whereas, I alledge the words of Chriſt himſelf for the truth of my doctrine, who expreſsly ſaid "*this* "*is my body.*" To this argument what can a ſimple Proteſtant reply? He feels that his eyes have been put out by his own eſtabliſhment, and thankfully gives his hand to one, who courteouſly promiſes to lead him, and, at the ſame time, ſpeaks with ſuch confident boaſting, of the infallibility of his Church.

There is another reaſon for wiſhing to apply ſome remedy to ſo cruel and inveterate an evil. It is viſible that the torrent of vice and profligacy is bearing down all before it; and it is equally viſible that the preſent mode of diſpenſing the Goſpel is unable to ſtop it. There is indeed but too much reaſon to ſuſpect that the eſtabliſhment itſelf affords ſome countenance to this general corruption of manners. For while that affirms it to be the *firſt duty* of a Chriſtian, a duty neceſſary above all others, ſo neceſſary that he who fails in it, "ſhall "without doubt periſh everlaſtingly," to believe what neither is, nor can be the object of belief; it is eaſy to conceive how the merit of ſo ſtrong a faith, required under ſo dreadful a ſanction, is likely to operate. When the ſinner has once perſuaded himſelf that he has it, he will be apt to balance it againſt many relaxations of his ſpiritual diſcipline, depending on the great ſecurity of all, his exalted faith; thus he will become gradually careleſs of, what would require much labour and mortification, the regulation of his thoughts and appetites, of bringing his whole body and ſoul into ſubjection to the obedience of Chriſt.

But even this is not the worſt of thoſe diſmal conſequences, that have followed this deſertion of the inſpired Scriptures, and inveſting human conceits with Divine authority. Already a large part

of

of ſenſible but not ſufficiently ſerious men are become Infidels: Surely therefore it becomes thoſe, whoſe particular concern it is, maturely to conſider how far our preſent plan is calculated to check this prevailing apoſtacy. There men deſert, becauſe every human eſtabliſhment they examine revolts their underſtanding; and they will ſeek Chriſtianity no where elſe, while they are told they may find it there, in its true features, delineated and aſcertained to their hands. This way of ſeeking information, however in reality inexcuſable, affords a plauſible pretext for their deſertion, and as they flatter themſelves, juſtifies them to their conſciences. For this evil there can be no remedy, but the public diſavowal of human deciſions, and ſending men for the learning of Chriſtianity, directly to the Scriptures. In theſe genuine records the honeſt and unprejudiced among them would find it not only the moſt amiable, but at the ſame time the plaineſt and moſt intelligible religion, that ever was profeſſed among men.

The bleſſed Author of it preached to the poor, and choſe them preferably to men of higher ſtations and accompliſhments. If he had taught in the ſtrain of Athanaſianiſm, I beg to be informed, what unlearned hearer would have been edified, or believed to ſalvation? Indeed not the unlearned only, but the moſt improved underſtanding upon

earth, never did, nor ever can reconcile the Athanaſian doctrine to common ſenſe. The Souths, the Bennets, the Waterlands, the Sherlocks, and Wallis's, and a long liſt beſides, all undertook to explain this inexplicable doctrine, and the conſequence was, that they diſagreed utterly in their explications, and hung millſtones, not deſignedly indeed, about the neck of Chriſtianity; ſome making three, ſome four, and ſome but one God; ſome even leaving it dubious, whether they made any God at all. Nay, ſome were ſo whetted in the diſpute, that they pronounced Anathemas on their opponents *, and if they had held the temporal ſword, would probably have proceeded to the effuſion of blood.

If theſe champions of orthodoxy are ſo little at accord, it may be enquired, "what muſt common Chriſtians do?" If there is a doctrine of Chriſtianity ſo neceſſary to be believed, that without the belief of it we muſt "periſh everlaſtingly," and if this very doctrine is in itſelf ſo obſcure and abſtruſe, that all the ſtudy, and all the learning of the beſt informed and moſt dignified divines, has never yet been able to ſettle the very point which is required

* Witneſs the cenſure pronounced by the Univerſity of Oxford againſt Dr. Sherlock's explication.——Lindſey's Apology, Page 64.

to

to be believed; what, I aſk again, muſt the common Chriſtian do? One is prompted to cry out, the Lord have mercy on him. The Lord has had mercy on him, and given him a revelation, in which, if he do his duty to himſelf, he will be ſure to find ſalvation, though the name of Athanaſius, or of any of his diſcordant expoſitors, ſhall never come to his ears.

Let him go to his Bible, and take religion as his Saviour left it. There he will find that there is one God the Father, and that there is no other but he; that this gracious God ſent his beloved Son into the world, to teach mankind a moſt pure and animating religion; that *he raiſed him from the dead, and highly exalted him*, in reward of his obedience, to a kingdom and power, which he muſt hold and exerciſe till the conſummation of all things, and then reſign to God who gave it; that he ſtill ſends his Holy Spirit to ſtrengthen him in weakneſs, and comfort him in diſtreſs. This every man can underſtand, and this is all that the Scriptures teach, or require to be believed with regard to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. Let thoſe who think themſelves wiſer than God, and undertake to amend his language, enjoy their prejudice, or preſumption, but let them not lay ſtumbling blocks in the way of their more cautious brethren, nor pronounce them reprobate, for chooſing to

take their ideas of God from the written word, and it only. Though Chriſtianity is not likely to become the general religion, till the perſonal unity of God is generally acknowledged, yet, in the mean time, both parties may enſure their own ſalvation, if they walk in brotherly love, and are careful to work it out by ſuch knowledge as both are agreed in. *To their own maſter both parties muſt ſtand or fall*, and neither hath the ſmalleſt authority to judge the other, except what is derived from *the Powers that be*, whoſe object is only the affairs of this world.

This controverſy muſt be decided by the inſpired Scriptures alone, and human authority ſet entirely out of the caſe; yet perhaps the authority of Clemens Romanus, the ſcholar and ſucceſſor of Peter the Apoſtle, may fairly be conſidered as ſomething more than human. If any man, whoſe writings are come down to us, could know the true doctrine of the Apoſtles, he is moſt to be depended on. He, however, has preſented us with no Athanaſian Trinity in his excellent epiſtle to the Corinthians. On the contrary, ſays this venerable father, exhorting them to unity and concord, *We have one God and one Chriſt*. Could he thus formally have diſtinguiſhed God and Chriſt, if he had believed Chriſt to be God, in the higheſt ſenſe of the word? Can words more poſitively expreſs that

God

God is *one*, and Chriſt *another?* He concludes with this truly Apoſtolical benediction and doxology, "*The grace of Chriſt Jeſus our Lord*, be with you, "and with all in every place, who have been called "of *God* through *him*." *God* the *caller*, *Chriſt* the inſtrument, by whom he called; ſurely he thought them not the ſame. "By *whom* (Chriſt) to *him* "(God) be glory, honour, might, majeſty, and "everlaſting dominion for ever. Amen." How unlike the concluſion of modern ſermons, "Now "to God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, to "*him* (one good Dean has ſaid to *them* *) be aſcrib-"ed all might, majeſty, dominion and power?"

I have all along ſuppoſed you to be ſerious, and really believe you to be ſo; but you have made ſo many ludicrous applications of texts of Scripture, and your whole performance is ſo ſtrongly marked with the features of burleſque, that this belief requires no ſmall effort of charity. You have indeed afforded plentiful matter to Infidels and Scoffers to exerciſe their talents of ridicule, and if this could fall on yourſelf alone, it is no more than you juſtly deſerve. But theſe men will not diſcriminate; they will take things as you repreſent them, and turn their wit prophanely on the Scriptures, which your indiſcretion has prepared for

* Dean of Gloceſter's lately publiſhed Sermons; page 54.

their

their purpoſe. You will not, however, be perſuaded, that you have hung up Chriſtianity as a laughing-ſtock for fools and profligates. It is viſible you triumph in your imaginary "confutation" of Mr. Lindſey, and poſſibly, as the noted Giant-killer never reſted while there was a Giant in the land, may be prompted, by the pride of victory, to attack the other, as you will account him, moſt Heretical apologiſt *. If this ſhould happen to be the caſe, pray, Sir, take the trouble to fix ideas to your words, and to make your ideas conſiſtent. With this ſerious and friendly advice, I bid you moſt heartily farewell.

* Benjamin Ben Mordecai, whoſe Apology was, ſome of it, publiſhed in the courſe of the laſt year; a work fraught with learning and good ſenſe.

POSTSCRIPT.

POSTSCRIPT.

PAGE 124. "Who being in the form of God, "thought it not robbery to be equal with "God; but made himſelf of no reputation, and "took upon him the form of a ſervant, and was "made in the likeneſs of men; and being found in "faſhion as a man, he humbled himſelf and be-"came obedient unto death, even the death of "the Croſs. Phil. ii. 6, 7, 8."

I did not conſider this text in its due courſe, becauſe it carries in it ſuch evident proofs that Jeſus Chriſt is not the Supreme God, that I could hardly conceive it poſſible for the moſt negligent reader not to ſee them. But as you ſay, "If this text "ſtood without another to ſupport it, it is con-"cluſive for the Godhead (meaning Supreme God-"head) of Jeſus Chriſt," and as there may poſſibly be readers as prejudiced as yourſelf, I will here give it a particular examination.

The

The Greek words of the ſixth verſe, on which the Apoſtle's argument turns, are theſe. Ὃς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπαρχων, οὐχ ἁρπαγμον ἡγησατο το εἶναι ισα Θεῶ. You endeavour to prove that ἐν μορφῇ Θεου ὑπαρχων, *being in the form of God* is the ſame as if the Apoſtle had ſaid *being God*, i. e. *Supreme God*; and you take it for granted that οὐχ ἁρπαγμον ἡγησατο is rightly tranſlated, *thought it not robbery*. Putting therefore your ſenſe on both expreſſions, let us try what can be made of the Apoſtle's words. You muſt conſider the words *being Supreme God* either as containing the reaſon, why Chriſt thought it no robbery, or the circumſtances in which he thought it none. On the former ſuppoſition St. Paul ſpeaks to this effect, *who, becauſe he was the Supreme God, thought it no robbery*, conſidered it as no act of injuſtice or uſurpation, *to be equal with the Supreme God; but* ſteadily inſiſted on his right.—Softly, good Sir; St. Paul ſays directly the contrary, though, if the ſenſe of the former part of the ſentence were rightly aſſumed, he could have ſaid nothing but this.

On the latter ſuppoſition, the ſentence will run thus; *Who, though he was Supreme God, yet thought it no robbery to be equal with the Supreme God.* Such ſenſe, nay, rather ſuch nonſenſe, could never be uttered by inſpiration. But let us go on, and conſider

ſider the Apoſtle's view; he is recommending humility by the example of Chriſt. Thus, therefore, according to you, he argues; "Let this mind (of "humility) be in you, which was alſo in Chriſt "Jeſus, who, though he was the Supreme God, "yet conſidered it as no act of injuſtice or robbery "to be equal to the Supreme God; *but*, on the "contrary, emptied himſelf, and, inſtead of con-"ſidering it as a matter of wrong or robbery, to "be equal with the Supreme God, became a man "of the loweſt and moſt deſpicable condition, even "a ſlave." It really ſurpaſſes my comprehenſion to conceive, what exerciſe of humility there could be in our Saviour's taking himſelf to be, what he really was, the Supreme God; and if there is not ſome condeſcenſion expreſſed in the preceding negative clauſe, what can the unlucky particle *but* have to do in the following? Is not this repreſenting the Apoſtle as affirming, that Chriſt ſhewed no humility of mind, at the ſame time that he ſhewed an humility inconceivably great?

Beſides; if Chriſt were the Supreme God, by what means did he ceaſe to be ſo? How was it poſſible, that he, who holds all his attributes by the neceſſity of his nature, ſhould diveſt himſelf of them, ſhould *empty* himſelf and ſink to the condition of the meaneſt and moſt diſtreſſed of mankind? The thing is abſolutely impoſſible, and St.

Paul could never ſay it. If by "made man" you mean that he "took the manhood into God," as the Athanaſian Creed informs us; then he was ſo far from being debaſed, that he was made, in however ſmall a proportion, greater. For whatſoever is added muſt make ſome increaſe, and the human powers added to the Divine muſt render them either more in number, or greater in efficacy. But this again is impoſſible; for he, who has all poſſible perfection, cannot be made greater, and if he could make himſelf ſo, it would be no mark of his humility.

When you tell us that "God was actually man," meaning the Supreme God, that "God was made "man," pray, Sir, do you mean to ſtand by the Nicene Creed, and to exclude the Athanaſian, which aſſerts the contrary, viz. "that the God-"head was not converted into fleſh," or "made "man," but "that the manhood was taken into "God?" So bare-faced a contradiction muſt, one would ſuppoſe, be not a little mortifying to ſo warm a defender of the preſent eſtabliſhed forms. You may take whether propoſition you pleaſe, but both cannot be true; though a profeſſion of the belief of both is commanded to be made in the ſolemneſt manner, in the face of God, and his congregation, on the ſame day, within the ſame half hour, under the penalty for the diſbelief of one of them,

them, ſo far as human authority can inflict it, of eternal damnation. When one witneſs depoſes in direct contradiction to another, ſurely thoſe are hardly uſed, who are compelled to avouch the veracity of both. It is indeed equally impoſſible that the Supreme God ſhould be made man, and that man ſhould be made Supreme God, or indeed any part of him, who has "no parts." To bind men therefore to the belief of theſe two Creeds, at leaſt as you underſtand the word God in both, is binding them to the belief of the ſtrangeſt medley of contradictions. Have a little charity therefore, I beſeech you, for conſcientious men, who ſolicit relief againſt ſo grievous an oppreſſion.

Though it be certain enough that you have groſsly miſinterpreted the Apoſtle's words, yet perhaps it is not equally certain what his preciſe meaning was. The text has exerciſed the talents of many able critics, and ſtill there may be ſome doubt whether any of them have fully ſucceeded. Among ſuch names I am little ambitious of mixing mine; yet hope it will not look preſumtuous, if I ſubmit to the public judgment the idea, which the original words have raiſed in my mind.

The great difficulty lies in the word ἁρπαγμον, which is generally ſuppoſed to ſignify actively, ipſa actio rapiendi, *the very act of ſeizing*. If the

word is taken in this ſenſe, all the foregoing abſurdities will follow; and therefore St. Paul certainly meant it not in this ſenſe. The word itſelf ſo ſeldom occurs, that there is no fixing its meaning from other authors; though the kindred term ἁρπαγμα, and even ἁρπαγμα ἡγεισθαι, is frequent enough. If the words in this place had been ἁρπαγμα ἡγησατο, the meaning would have been clear, non, ut prædam, arripuit, non prædam ſibi duxit, *he conſidered it not as a thing, which he had a right to ſeize, and hold faſt as his own.* In this very ſenſe, it is probable that the Apoſtle uſed ἁρπαγμον, and the indefatigable Wetſtein has quoted one place at leaſt where ἁρπαγμον muſt be ſo underſtood. For my own part, I have ſometimes ſuſpected that ἁρπαγμον may poſſibly be a paſſive adjective of that ſort of ſignification, which adjectives in *bilis* and participles in *dus* have among the Latins; and in this caſe, the meaning of the expreſſion would be indiſputably determined to the ſame effect, as has been juſt ſet down.

Theocritus has ſaid,

"Ευδετ' εμα βρεφεα γλυκερον κ) ἐγερσιμον ὑπνον,

"Idyll. 24. line 7."

"Sleep

"Sleep my babes, a ſweet, and (if one may ſay ſo "in Engliſh) a wakeable ſleep." I ſuppoſe, therefore, ἁρπαγμον to be formed as a paſſive adjective from ἁρπαζω by the ſame kind of analogy as ἐγερσιμος from ἐγειρω.

But be this conjecture right or wrong, if ἁρπαγμον is equivalent to ἁρπαγμα, as indeed there can be little doubt it is in this paſſage, the text will prove as ſtrongly as poſſible againſt the Athanaſian Trinity; and that, whether the word God be underſtood of the Father, or of the Son. It appears to me to be more eligible to underſtand it of the Son, and the abſence of the article is not unfavourable to that interpretation. What that μορφη Θεϑ, that *form of God*, that divine ſtate and character, was in his original undiminiſhed glory, may be conjectured from thoſe amazing ſplendors that ſurrounded him at the transfiguration. *We beheld*, ſays St. John, who was one of the three diſciples preſent at this wonderful tranſaction, *his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father.* Great as theſe ſplendors were, I conceive the Apoſtle to repreſent him as not eager to retain them, when he could accompliſh ſo benevolent a purpoſe, by ſuſpending his poſſeſſion of them, as bringing mankind to everlaſting ſalvation. His argument will proceed thus; *Who did not think that*

he

he ought, as it were, to lay firm hold on that Godlike dignity, ſo as never to give it up; to ſeize it as a matter of indiſpenſable conſequence to be always the ſame great and ſtupendous Perſonage (το ειναι ισα Θεῳ); *to preſerve a perpetual equality of that inconceivable majeſty, which he had being yet* Θεος, not ὁ Θεος, next to the Supreme God, the moſt glorious being in the univerſe; *but emptied himſelf of all this, and took* μορφην δουλου, *the form and character of a ſlave; in which character he was ſeen, when he became obedient to the ſervile death of crucifixion.* Thus the ſame perſon, who at one period of his exiſtence, had been the repreſentative of the Father's glory, whom all ſpiritual created intelligences beheld with diſtant wonder, at another, became a moſt miſerable and deſpiſed *man*, an unjuſtly condemned and dying convict, that he might reconcile apoſtatized mankind to God. Here every thing is real, clear, intelligible, glorious, and amazing. What an example of humility? Who will not be made truly humble by motives ſo irreſiſtably endearing?

Page 192. "Father if it be poſſible, let this cup "paſs away from me," and—"knowing that Je- "ſus Chriſt died for our redemption, I hereby per- "ceive the love of *God*, becauſe he laid down his "life for us. 1 John iii. 16."

It is amazing that a man, who undertakes to explain Scripture to his ignorant brethren, ſhould himſelf be ſo ignorant. The word Θεϖ, God, is a manifeſt interpolation, being found in but one Greek manuſcript out of one hundred and twenty, uſed by Wetſtein *, and that of a low age, and very bad authority. Of printed editions of any repute, it is only to be found in the Complutenſian and Genevan, and of verſions the modern Engliſh only has it. But there is no occaſion to appeal to manuſcripts, editions, or verſions, to reprobate the word. It is impoſſible St. John ſhould have wrote ἐκεινος for he, referred to an antecedent immediately preceding. Either he would have uſed no pronoun at all, or if he had thought proper to uſe one, αὐτος muſt have been the word. There is a uſe of the Greek pronoun ἐκεινος very frequent in all authors, when they mean to mark out a perſon with particular emphaſis, without naming him. This, and no other, muſt be its meaning in this paſſage; and theſe are the words of the Apoſtle literally tranſlated, *By* this *we have known love, that he* (Jeſus Chriſt emphatically denoted) *laid down his life for us.*

* I do not mean that all theſe MSS. had the Epiſtles of John, but that it was wanting in all, that had them, except one.

At

At page 95, where you quote Coloſſ. i. 16, 17, by way of proving that Jeſus Chriſt has the ſame attributes with his God and Father, it might have been obſerved, that every expreſſion in the original ſeems to be deciſive of his inferiority, by exhibiting him as the Father's miniſter. The words are, ἐν αὐτῳ ἐκτισθη τα παντα—τα παντα δι' αὐτυ ἐκτισται—τα παντα ἐν αὐτῳ συνεστηκε. The prepoſitions ἐν and δια never, I think, expreſs primary independent agency. To convey that idea indiſputably, the Apoſtle muſt have uſed the prepoſition ὑπο, or perhaps παρα; ἐν and δια meaning, ordinarily at leaſt, the agency of a miniſter, a perſon employed under the controul of a firſt mover. This, therefore, I take to be the ſenſe of the original words; *by his miniſtration all things were created——all things have been created by his miniſtration——by him*, that is, *by his miniſtration all things* (the whole univerſe, if you pleaſe) *conſiſt*, cohere, and continue as one regular connected ſyſtem. You, however, ſeem to be one of thoſe, who chooſe not to hang their faith upon an ἀπο or an ἐπι, though the true ſenſe of all language depends, in a very great degree, on the right underſtanding of its particles. The innumerable blunders you have been drawn into by the Engliſh tranſlation, muſt entirely ruin your reputation as a ſcholar; or if you really knew better,

better, and gave an undue preference to the tranſlation, becauſe it was moſt for your purpoſe, you have been your own enemy in a ſtill more material reſpect.

But the worſt part of your ill luck, in adducing this paſſage as a proof of your propoſition, has not yet been pointed out. It will ruin your favourite diſtinction of two natures in Chriſt, and conſequently the whole Athanaſian hypotheſis, irretrievably. For, how ſay you, Sir? ſhall we impute this wonderful work of creation to Chriſt in "his greater nature," as he was God; or ſhall we conſider him as having created all things in heaven and in earth, in "his leſs nature," as he was man? It behoves you to make a deliberate choice. If you ſay the former, then here is what amounts to the poſitive aſſertion of an inſpired Apoſtle, that Chriſt, in his greater nature, is inferior to the Father: For we are told, in the words preſently following, that he effected this greateſt of his mighty works by the *fullneſs*, which it *pleaſed the Father* to confer upon him; which communication of the Father would have been both unneceſſary, and impoſſible, if Chriſt had been abſolutely perfect before. If, on the contrary, you ſay, that he created all things in heaven and in earth, as he was man; then you cannot mean that he had any concern in the original

creation, which was paſt, many ages, before he exiſted in his human nature. On this ſuppoſition, you give a Socinian ſenſe to the words, and add one more to the liſt of Hereſies, that have already been proved upon you, having quoted the paſſage to no kind of purpoſe whatſoever.

FINIS.

14 JY 60

BOOKS printed for J. BELL, No. 132, Strand, London, and C. ETHERINGTON, York.

The Subſtance of Lord CHESTERFIELD's Letters, which at preſent form the Converſation amongſt all polite Companies, is now comprized in a ſmall elegant Volume, dedicated, by Permiſſion, to the Right Hon. Lord Viſcount LIGONIER,

And is this Day publiſhed, price 2 s. 6 d.

Principles of POLITENESS,

By the late Lord CHESTERFIELD.

Methodized and digeſted under diſtinct Heads, with Additions.

By the Rev. Dr. JOHN TRUSLER.

CONTAINING,

Every Inſtruction neceſſary to complete the Gentleman and Man of Faſhion, to teach him a Knowledge of Life, and make him well received in all Companies, for the Improvement of Youth, yet not beneath the Attention of any one.

A Second PART of the ſame Book is juſt publiſhed, price 2 s.

HENRY the SECOND;

OR,

The FALL of ROSAMOND.

By THOMAS HULL.

The FIFTH EDITION.

Ornamented with a beautiful engraved Vignette, repreſenting the beauteous Roſamond falling a Sacri-

fice to the Vengeance of the injured Queen. Engraved from an original Design, made on Purpose for this interesting Subject. Price 1 s. 6 d.

REMARKS

ON

Mr. THOMAS HENRY's

Improved Method of preparing

MAGNESIA ALBA.

With an easy chemical Process of procuring it in the utmost Perfection, without leaving any gritty Remainder.

To which is added,

An APPENDIX.

By a PHYSICIAN.

Price One Shilling and Sixpence.

An EASY WAY to prolong LIFE,

Being a Chemical Analysis, or an Enquiry into the Nature and Properties of all Kinds of Food, how far they are wholesome and agree with different Constitutions. Written so as to be intelligent to every Capacity.

By a MEDICAL GENTLEMAN.

Price Two Shillings.

The FOURTH EDITION.

Alſo, the Second PART. Containing many ſalutary Obſervations on Exerciſe, Sleep, Drinking, Smoaking, Bleeding, Dram-drinking, and the Utility of taking Phyſic in the Spring.

Price One Shilling and Sixpence.

The THIRD EDITION.

THE

GENTLEMAN's and LADY's POCKET COMPANION in the GARDEN,

Or a Calendar, pointing out what ſhould be done every Month in the Green-houſe, Flower, Fruit, and Kitchen-garden, with the proper Seaſons for ſowing, planting, &c. ſo as to have a regular Succeſſion of Flowers and Vegetables throughout the Year.

To which is added,

A compleat LIST of the Flowers that blow each Month.

Though of ſo ſmall a Size, no one Thing is omitted.

Price One Shilling.

Neatly printed, no bigger than a Pocket Almanack.

N. B. With the Help of this Book, Gentlemen may inſtruct any Country Servant to look after a ſmall Piece of Ground, at a very little Expence, make that Ground go a great Way, and ſupply their Tables with every Thing in Seaſon. It will enable the Ladies alſo to diſpoſe their Flowers to the beſt Advantage, and procure a general Bloom throughout the Year.

THE
OECONOMIST,

Shewing in a Variety of Eſtimates from 80l. a Year to upwards of 800l. how comfortably and genteely a Family may live with Frugality, for a little Money;

Together with the Cheapeſt Method of keeping
HORSES.

Note. An Attention to theſe Eſtimates will infallibly tend to the Comfort and Happineſs of Thouſands, as they will teach the Reader how to make a Little go a great Way, and ſhew him what Expences he may enter into conſiſtent with his Fortune and Situation in Life.

Price One Shilling.

The NINTH EDITION.

TEN MINUTES ADVICE
TO EVERY
GENTLEMAN

Going to purchaſe a HORSE out of a Dealer, Jockey, or Groom's Stables, in which are laid down eſtabliſhed Rules for diſcovering the Perfections and Blemiſhes of that noble Animal.

Price One Shilling.

BELL's EDITION

OF THE

Gentleman's Pocket Farrier,

Shewing how to uſe your Horſe on a Journey, and what Remedies are proper for common Accidents that may befal him on the Road.

Price One Shilling.

Neatly printed on thin Poſt Paper, very ſmall Size, on purpoſe to lay in a Pocket Book.

This little Tract has been in great Eſtimation for theſe Fifty Years paſt, and has gone through many Editions in Ireland. The Remedies it preſcribes are ſimple and eaſily obtained, and never fail of a Cure, where the Diſorder is Curable, and no Man who values his Horſe ſhould preſume to travel without it.

N. B. Be careful to aſk for BELL's Edition of this uſeful little Book, as the extraordinary Encouragement it daily experiences, has excited the Envy of ſome other Bookſellers, who have deſcended ſo very low as to copy the Title of it nearly Verbatim, with a Pretence of giving ſome other USELESS Additions, in order to obtrude with more Facility their own Trumpery, when this uſeful Treatiſe may be wanted.

THE FRIENDS;

OR,

Original LETTERS of a Perſon, deceaſed;

Now Firſt Publiſhed from the Manuſcript in his Correſpondent's Hands.

In TWO VOLUMES.

Price Six Shillings, bound.

BELL's EDITION
OF
SHAKESPEARE's WORKS,
COMPLEAT,
INCLUDING HIS POEMS.

PRICES.

	£.	s.	d.
On large Royal Paper, in 9 vols. ſewed,	1	18	0
On Demy Paper, — in 9 vols. ſewed,	1	7	0

The CONTINUATION,
To complete the Firſt Five Volumes.

PRICES.

	£.	s.	d.
On large Royal Paper, in 4 vols. ſewed,	0	17	0
On Demy Paper, — in 4 vols. ſewed,	0	12	0

A few prime Impreſſions of the complete Set of Prints, conſiſting of 41 *ſtriking Dramatic Subjects, including the much-admired Likeneſs of the Author, and of David Garrick, Eſq; are preſerved on Proof Paper, and will be ſold for Cabinet Furniture, or to bind up with any other Editions,*

At One Guinea and a Half per Set.